

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. XLVII

OCTOBER, 1949

NO. 1042

Retrospect on Liberalism

MOST REV. GEORGE ANDREW BECK, A.A.
Coadjutor Bishop of Brentwood, England

*Reprinted from the CLERGY REVIEW**

ALTHOUGH the name "Liberal" was first used in Spain in the 1820's in opposition to the word "servile," and was intended to denote the party which stood for constitutional and national freedom, the idea of Liberalism goes back much further in history. If it does not belong altogether to the age of the Reformation (in spite of what many history textbooks suggest) it does certainly belong to the seventeenth century. Superficially, it appeared as a political movement directed against monarchy and despotism. It produced those bills of rights or declarations of rights which were taken to be a guarantee to the individual against arbitrary taxation or imprisonment, and promised to him liberty of speech, of the press and of association. On the more positive side the Liberal movement was responsible for the development of what is called constitutional

or Parliamentary government, in which the power to rule is conferred in some measure on elected representatives of the people. It is this aspect of Liberalism which is prominent in our political histories and is seen in its great achievements of the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 in this country, or the American or French Revolutions a century later. This is the individual aspect of Liberalism which has been, perhaps, over-emphasized.

The French Revolution, oddly enough, did not work out according to the ideal pattern of 1688. The Jacobins produced a perverted form of Liberalism which ended in mob tyranny and the destruction of individual freedom. Both here and in America the orthodox Liberals reacted against what they saw to be the excesses of the French Revolution. As an American historian has

neatly put it, they developed in that period an almost pathological aversion to mobs¹.

Yet Liberalism was universalist in outlook. It was a doctrine for all men. The ending of the Napoleonic era in 1815 saw the flowering of romanticism, and with it flourished the idea that any people under a foreign rule were opposed or enslaved, and that alien rule must be in some senses a tyranny. In this way a cross-current came into Liberalism which was in one respect firmly attached to the cosmopolitan and universalist ideas of the eighteenth century and yet was becoming wedded to the ideals of nascent nationalism.

The next stage was the reaction of the Liberal mind to growing industrialism. Here the business outlook combined only too well with the Liberal ideals, and these received support from Puritanism and Non-conformity. The regulation of trade and industry, remnants of a medieval past, saturated with religious obscurantism, was merely another form of tyranny which must be overthrown. So we have the introduction of freedom of trade, freedom of contract, freedom to buy and sell, to employ or to dismiss with a minimum of restriction by Church or State or guild or trade union. The elect of God were blessed in their affairs. This was the Liberalism whose father was Adam Smith and whose progeny was the Manchester school.

Here again, however, cross-cur-

rents occurred. Some Liberals saw a tyranny in capitalism itself. They saw the individual workman gripped in a wage slavery and they turned with idealism, with romanticism and with much imagination to the doctrines of socialism and anarchism.

OPPOSED TO THE CHURCH

Perhaps the most important thing about all this movement of ideas was that it claimed to stand for religious toleration—and hence was always opposed to the Catholic Church. The Church to the Liberal mind was always obscurantist, it was always intransigent, always the foe of individual liberty. Liberals found themselves speaking of it in terms of the tyranny of priestcraft and the shibboleth "theocracy." They set to work, therefore, to emancipate the minds of the young from any clerical domination. There must be liberty of thought, liberty of conscience, liberty of worship and, of course, very little liberty for the Church.

This point brings us face to face with the true problem of Liberalism as it affects the Catholic. The various forms of Liberalism all have a common source. They all suppose both the natural perfectibility of man and his natural self-sufficiency. It has been said that Liberalism is a way of life, a spirit, a habit of mind, in fact a kind of religion—the religion of "this-worldliness." It has been described as "a belief in the natural dignity of man," in "his high des-

¹ Carlton J. H. Hayes, *A Generation of Materialism 1871-1900*. The present paper owes much to this remarkable book.

tiny," in "his ability to perfect himself through natural reason and self-determination," in "the ultimate triumph of truth, justice and freedom." It has been spoken of as "the consciousness which the free man has of his rights and of his duties." It is said to stand for "loftiness of view, generosity of sentiment." It is above all based on the idea that Humanity (always with a capital H) can be enlightened by discussion and improved by the very experience of its own errors. It has got rid of the idea of a personal God.

Much of what it says seems at first sight very uplifting and much of it would be inspiring if it only kept in touch with reality. Yet the men who professed this faith rejected any ethical restrictions in either business or political life, and inevitably brought a case of conscience before the Church. When they went further and advocated absolute freedom of thought, of religion, of conscience, of speech and press, and denied any authority derived from God, they ranged themselves immediately in opposition to the Church, whose duty it is to proclaim with God's authority His message to man.

One of the troubles with the Liberals, in fact, was that they were mesmerized by the beauty of words and failed so often to define their meaning. Above all they failed to face ultimate questions. We have a long

array of words which had a profound effect on the thought of the century and eventually did man immense harm. "Liberty," "Equality," "Fraternity," "Reason," "Natural Law," "Oppression," "Tyranny," "Emancipation," all led on to the idea that man should be free from every restraint, which means, in fact, that man should be the master and the measure of all things. He is independent of the Divine Law and ends by taking to himself, perhaps unconsciously, the dignity of a god. This is the absurdity at which Liberalism eventually arrived. It, so to speak, consecrated the sin of Adam. And against this absurdity the Church has had to wage a continuous war. She has always held that these principles, if logically applied, can lead only to tyranny or to chaos. She has had to insist that the only liberty worthy of a man is the liberty to do the things he ought to do, and not just the liberty to do the things he naturally likes to do. She has had to insist on the purpose of freedom and not the technique of freedom—on the end rather than the means.

SECULARIZING PROCESS

This is the fundamental reason for the opposition between so many Liberal movements of the nineteenth century and the teaching of the Church. As a result of its principles the whole Liberal movement was a secularizing

process which degraded the end of man and which finished by transferring, gradually perhaps, but relentlessly, the social functions of the Church to the State, and of the clergy to the laity. Liberalism, quite unwittingly at first, induced people to look to the secular state as the source both of moral and physical sustenance and hence to regard the Church as something superfluous in social life, a luxury in which one indulged or not, according to one's fancy. It made, in fact, for indifference towards religion, and produced that attitude of mind which makes religion irrelevant to living. Anybody who attempted to arrest this movement was branded as a clerical and the answer to any criticism was a vigorous anti-clericalism.

This aspect of the movement was not strongly evident in England where the great Churchman, Gladstone, was the paragon of Liberalism. Continental Liberalism, however, especially in the latter half of the nineteenth century, was something bitterly hostile to the Church. It was a sectarian Liberalism, not only anti-clerical but violently anti-Christian. Its outlook was utilitarian, and its creed was based on evolution and the materialist aspects of nature and social science. Its strength was particularly in the radical political parties, in the lodges of continental freemasonry, in the societies, strongest perhaps in France, that were bent on the complete laicizing of the State and of public education, and of restricting the clergy merely to their work in the sacristy.

Newman saw this very clearly as early as 1841, and in the note on Liberalism in his *Apologia* in 1863 he sets out eighteen propositions which, as he puts it, "I earnestly denounced and adjured." They emphasize how completely the Liberal attitude is opposed to Catholic teaching on all that relates to revelation and the supernatural, as well as being dangerous to the social health of the state. Here are some samples from the passage in the *Apologia*:

"No religious tenet is important unless reason shows it to be so" (1). "No theological doctrine is anything more than an opinion which happens to be held by bodies of men" (3). "It is immoral in a man to believe more than he can spontaneously receive as being congenial to his moral and mental nature" (5). "No revealed doctrines or precepts may reasonably stand in the way of scientific conclusions" (6). "There is a system of religion more simply true than Christianity as it has ever been received" (8). "Utility and expedience are the measure of political duty" (13). "The Civil Power may dispose of Church property without sacrilege" (14). "The people are the legitimate source of power" (17). "Virtue is the child of knowledge and vice of ignorance" (18).

The list itself is a tribute to the extraordinary foresight and the penetrating power of analysis which was part of Newman's genius. With his clear idea of what Liberalism stood for, it is not surprising that he declared towards the end of his life: "for thirty, forty, fifty years I have resisted to the best of my power the spirit of Liberalism in religion."

In this country the heyday of economic Liberalism in terms of free trade dates from the repeal of the Corn Laws, in 1846, to about 1870, when we see the beginnings of collectivism creeping into the legislation of this country. On the continent the same dates hold good; 1848 has been called the year of revolution. It is signified by the flight of Metternich from Austria, the foundation of the short-lived second Republic in France, the brief, bitter anti-clerical episode of the Roman republic, with Pope Pius IX obliged to flee from Rome, to seek protection in the south. The other date, 1870, means the Franco-Prussian War; the Russian repudiation of the Black Sea clause in the Treaty of Paris; the triumph of Bismarck, the chancellor of blood and iron; and the full emergence of that new terrible force, the nation state, fighting in arms, not only for existence but for domination.

There are certain great landmarks in the period: 1848, when Karl Marx published the *Communist Manifesto*; 1859, when Darwin published his book on the *Origin of Species*, and J. S. Mills his essay on *Liberty*. This was the year, too, of Magenta and Solferino—the brief glory of Napoleon III's invasion of Italy; the beginning of the triumph of Cavour to make Italy more than a geographical expression. 1866 saw Bismarck break the power of Austria in the Seven Weeks' War; 1870 saw Italian unification achieved. The Pope became "the prisoner of the Vatican" and Bismarck had already picked his quarrel with France.

ATTACKS RELIGIOUS ORDERS

Is it possible to crystallize this Liberal movement and spirit in a single gesture? Some might say that the evolutionist movement with its idea of inevitable progress, or that the extension of the franchise, is the great characteristic of the Liberal epoch. A more appropriate gesture to single out is its attack on the religious orders of the Church. This started in Portugal and Spain in the 1820's and perhaps the most significant incident in the history of the unification of Italy is Cavour's suppression of nearly 350 religious houses in the little kingdom of Piedmont during the 1850's. More than 4000 monks and about 1200 nuns were expelled from their religious houses. What Cavour did in Piedmont was merely a little beginning, but it was significant; and it was imitated. In 1860 most of the religious houses in Italy were expropriated. In 1868 the Jesuits were suppressed in Spain and with them all communities founded after 1837. Their property was confiscated by the State. In 1872 Germany expelled the Jesuits, and in 1875 Prussia abolished all other orders except those engaged in nursing. France followed a little later. In 1880 the Jesuits and Assumptionists were suppressed or driven out. The battle here was a long one and it was most bitter.

During all this time the Liberal movement was being swept off its course or driven into a new channel by the strong cross-current of growing Nationalism.

The Church and the whole Cath-

olic tradition have always insisted on the duty of patriotism as a continuation or an extension of the virtue of charity. And love of country has always been defended in Catholic thought as founded on some of the best natural human instincts. But Nationalism in the sense in which it is condemned by the Church is a vicious thing, an exaggeration, corrupted by hatred, cruelty, snobbery and often bordering on a sort of idolatry. It has been defined as the system or the movement which gives to the national state the supreme place in the scale of values. Its strength lies in its appeal to emotion and to mob instinct. It involves in this sense a sin against reason as well as a sin against faith.

INTENSIFIED NATIONALISM

In the early part of the nineteenth century this Nationalism, wedded to the Liberal spirit, fought mainly for what was commonly called the emancipation of oppressed peoples from the tyranny of a foreign power. This was the Liberalism of the Prussian revival and the Italian *Risorgimento*—of Palmerston and Gladstone—of Guizot, Thiers, O'Connell and Emile Laveleye. But, as the century progressed, Nationalism both intensified and changed in character. It dropped the trappings of romanticism, it ceased to be pacific and broadminded. It grew self-centered, warlike, even imperialistic. And it began to absorb all the loyalties and the energies of the people.

Many surveys have been written of the development and growth of

the nationalist spirit. Few, however, have dwelt on two fruits of that spirit which have meant the suicide of Liberalism and the emergence of the totalitarian state. I mean the growth of the system of conscripted military service and the development of the national control of education.

The idea of a conscript army belongs in modern times to the French Revolution, to the *levée en masse*. It was fostered in the fervid atmosphere of the tricolor, the throb of the *Marseillaise*, and exultant devotion to *La Patrie*. It means "the nation in arms" defending its frontiers; and at home the guillotine, destroying the enemies of France.

But scientifically organized conscription is a Prussian legacy. On the principle of universal compulsory army service, followed by periodical training and a long membership of the reserve, Bismarck built up the triumphant Prussian army of 1866 and 1870. Before 1860 the annual intake was 40,000 men serving for two years. That was changed to an intake of 63,000 men serving for three years. After the triumph of 1871 the system was extended to the whole German Empire. France replied in 1872, making every young Frenchman liable to military service for five years. And the French army was remodelled with territorial corps and a reorganized General Staff. Russia followed in 1874 with compulsory service at first for six years and then for five. In 1875 Italy reorganized her army and made every young able-bodied Italian liable for active service for from three to five years.

Bismarck, even after the Austrian Alliance of 1879, was not satisfied and in 1880 introduced another military bill to increase Germany's standing army to nearly half a million men. It is not difficult to see why the historians speak of the last thirty years of the nineteenth century as the period of armed peace—and how the building up of armaments, extending to what Professor Hayes has called "the new Navalism," and the fight for naval supremacy between this country and Germany, was bound to form in the minds of the young all over Europe that sense of unquestioning obedience to national governments, and unthinking support for nationalist and imperialist aspirations which characterized the entire period.

CONTROL OF EDUCATION

This idea of nationalist aspirations brings us to the other great fruit of Liberalism, the extension of State interest in, and eventually of State control of, education. It may seem at first sight strange that the Liberal mind which sought the emancipation of individuals from the restrictions of control helped in fact to establish a form of control which has perhaps done more than anything else to condition the minds of citizens to the service of the State and the government. The trouble with the Liberals was that they never thought out their principles—nor followed them to a logical conclusion. It took Leo XIII to do that for them. They represent, in fact, a curious compromise between a pacific cosmopolitanism

which was a hangover from the eighteenth century and an aggressive nationalism which became so violently effective in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Thus the Radicals in France, the left Liberals in Italy, the Austrian Liberals, were all more ready supporters of conscription and military expansion in the '60's and '70's than any of the so-called Conservative groups. It was in like manner the Liberals who were the supporters of policies of administrative centralization and national unification.

The Liberals approached the question of popular education with varying motives. There was, of course, the cynicism of Robert Lowe, who proclaimed that we "must educate our masters." But the intellectuals hoped to see an extension of human progress in the wide diffusion of scientific knowledge. The more materialist hoped to sow the seeds of sound economic principles among the masses and thus strengthen them against revolutionary propaganda. Popular state education, too, would be a means of fostering national patriotism and of fitting citizens for an intelligent share in political democracy—and also in military service. All over Europe in the '60's and '70's elaborate systems of state-supported or state-directed elementary education came into existence. The teachers were almost always lay employees of the government; and religious instruction, except in a most vague and general form, was excluded from the schools. Such systems came into existence or were perfected in Hungary

in 1868, in Austria in 1869, in England in 1870, in Switzerland in 1874, in the Netherlands in 1876, in Italy in 1877, in Belgium in 1879 and in France from 1881-86. In Germany, where state schools were already in existence, they were largely secularized in the '70's.

The Liberals, with that strange inconsistency which runs through all their activity, seemed to have no qualms of conscience in invoking for the sake of popular education the very principle of state compulsion which they were supposed to detest. In one country after another the setting up of elementary state schools was accompanied or followed by laws imposing the compulsory attendance of every child. They succeeded, it has been noted, in producing a noteworthy increase of literacy if not intelligence among the masses. It is not necessary to go into the various factors which contributed to this movement for mass education in the late '60's. An industrialized society, urban concentrations, easier travelling, humanitarian doctrines, the cry of "equality of opportunity," the hope that popular scientific education would destroy the influence of the Church, all had their part in fostering this movement.

The only question which raised bitterness and controversy was whether this popular education should include religious instruction or be exclusively lay and secular. At first the secularists triumphed. In Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, France, Austria and Hungary religious instruction was excluded from state schools and

barely tolerated in private Church schools, against which, in opposition to all Liberal principles, a form of discriminatory tariff was erected. Only in this country did the government continue to give some financial support to Church schools.

AN IMPORTANT RESULT OF POPULAR EDUCATION

Perhaps one of the most important results of popular education, less evident I think in this country than on the continent, was the recruiting of a staff of teachers who formed what has been described as a sort of officer corps for the army of mobilized children. Trained under government control, teaching under government supervision, their own interests were identified with the strengthening of the nationalist spirit and the attachment of the masses to their representative governments. It would be interesting in this respect to compare the attitudes of the teaching profession, either in universities or in more elementary schools, to the revolutionary movement of 1848 and, say, the wars of 1870 or 1914.

Thus by a strange confusion of ways and yet by an inner logic the Liberal movement has brought us to the verge of the totalitarian state.

What was the Church doing in the midst of these years of change? From 1846 to 1903 two great Popes occupied the See of Peter. At first sight it would seem that their reactions to this movement of thought, which was implicitly a denial of the supernatural, were totally dissimilar. People remember Pius IX because of the

Syllabus of 1864 and Leo XIII for such things as the *Ralliement* to the Republic in France or the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of 1891. Yet if we survey these two Pontificates together we can see that they achieve a remarkable unity in defining the attitude of the Church to the new secularist spirit.²

POPE CONDEMNS ERRORS

1854. On 8 December Pope Pius IX defined infallibly the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Our Blessed Lady. In doing so he laid down two cardinal principles on which the Church has taken her stand. The first is the declaration that the Pope, and indeed the Church, speaks with the authority of God, and the second, equally obvious but curiously neglected by the contemporaries of Pope Pius, is the teaching that all mankind, save only the Blessed Virgin, has fallen from grace and is subject to sin. The nineteenth century tended, with its ideal of perfectible man, to scoff at the idea of sin. Pius IX threw the whole weight of his authority into that implicit declaration that sin was a legacy which humanity could not escape.

1864. Again on 8 December, Pope Pius IX issued to the Bishops of the Church an encyclical letter entitled *Quanta Cura*, to which was attached a list of eighty propositions commonly known as the *Syllabus*, which were condemned as errors and pernicious doctrines. The *Syllabus* made

a tremendous stir at the time and was taken to be the last spasm of a dying Church overcome by the enlightenment and progress of the nineteenth century. The condemnation of the famous 80th proposition is the one which aroused the bitterest criticism of the Church. The proposition runs as follows: "The Roman Pontiff can and should reconcile himself and come to terms with progress, Liberalism and modern civilization." This was taken to mean that the Pope was hopelessly out of step with the modern age. The condemnation was just a "reactionary" gesture. Anticlericals felt that the *Syllabus* justified their attacks and that the Church was truly the enemy of progress. The Pope was the great obstacle to the emancipation of humanity. Yet it is worth while to remember one or two other propositions from the *Syllabus*:

1. There exists no supreme, all wise, most provident divine Being, distinct from the universe; God and nature are one, and God is therefore subject to change; actually, God is produced in man and in the world; God and the world are identical, as are spirit and matter, true and false, good and evil, just and unjust.

6. Faith in Christ is opposed to human reason; and divine revelation is not only unprofitable, but is even harmful to the perfection of man.

18. Protestantism is nothing but another form of the same true Christian religion, in which it is equally possible to please God as in the Catholic Church.

² For this short summary I am greatly indebted to Fr. R. Corrigan's book *The Church and the Nineteenth Century*, which was reviewed in these pages 1948, XXIX pp. 44-5.

21. The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion.

37. National Churches can be established after being withdrawn and openly separated from the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

39. The commonwealth is the origin and source of all rights, and enjoys rights which are not circumscribed by any limits.

40. The teaching of the Catholic Church is opposed to the well-being and interests of society.

64. The violation of a solemn oath and any atrocious crime against the eternal law is not only not reprehensible but lawful and worthy of the highest praise when done for the love of country.

65. The teaching that Christ elevated marriage to the dignity of a sacrament can in no way be admitted.

It is important to remember that these propositions were all taken from earlier Papal documents and they should be read in the context in which they first appeared. Thus the 80th proposition was taken from an allocution of Pope Pius IX in March 1861. Here is the context: "For a long time we have been witnesses of the troubles into which civil society, especially in our own time, has been thrown by the violent struggle being waged between opposing principles, between truth and error, virtue and vice, light and darkness. For some men, on the one hand, defend what they call modern civilization, others, on the contrary, defend the rights of justice and our holy religion. The first demand that the Roman Pontiff should reconcile him-

self and come to terms with progress, with Liberalism (these are their own expressions), in a word, with modern civilization." The Papal speech goes on to show that under these specious names of progress, Liberalism and civilization, there has been a movement to de-christianize the world and that such a movement should never be dignified by the name of civilization, except in a most materialist sense.

VATICAN COUNCIL

If the *Syllabus* was interpreted by the Liberals as the death spasm of an outworn Church, the solemn opening of the Vatican Council on 8 December, 1869, was looked upon as a gesture of defiance by the Papacy. The Council was concerned principally with the nature and functions of the Church and its great achievement was the definition of Papal Infallibility. What it might have done had Rome not been threatened by the forces of the Italian Government through the withdrawal of French troops for the defence of their country is known only to God.

The next ten years was a period of almost open hostility to the Church, particularly in Germany. When Pope Pius IX died in 1878 it looked as though Liberalism and Secularism, in spite of Papal condemnation, were about to triumph. Sixty-five old Cardinals entered the conclave in the Vatican to choose his successor. They acted quickly, perhaps even fearing interference. On 20 February, 1878, they chose Cardinal Pecci, a man of 68 years of age,

who had been Archbishop of Perugia for thirty-two years, to wear the ring of the Fisherman. Outside Italy he was almost unknown, though some remembered him as a Papal Nuncio in Belgium in the 1840's. He was thin and frail and not expected to live long. In some respects he was what one might call, with all due reverence, a makeshift Pope.

GREAT ENCYCLICALS

Yet Leo XIII lived on till 1903 for twenty-five years to the age of 93 and his pontificate has acquired a fame comparable to that of any of the great Popes of the Middle Ages. Leo might be frail in physique but he had a scholar's grasp of principles, a brilliant mind and a will of iron. He had, further, a sympathetic understanding not only of the intellectual problems of the age but of the social conditions engendered by the new industrialism. He was as determined as Gregory XVI or Pius IX to fight against materialism, agnosticism or indifferentism, but he was not content merely to condemn. With his pontificate we enter the period of the constructive exposition of the Christian alternative to the Liberal way of life.

Leo XIII will always be known as the Pope of the great encyclicals. It would require a whole book to analyse the teaching set out in these great pontifical documents. It is not possible to do more here than to underline some of the doctrines which Leo expounded for the Church. In almost the first of the long series of encyclicals the Pope pointed to the medieval scholastic philosophy of St.

Thomas Aquinas as the great corrective to the errors of modern philosophy. He urged most strongly its revival and extension. He founded and endowed a Pontifical Academy in Rome for this purpose. He directed the preparation of a new Leonine edition of the Angelic Doctor's writings. He encouraged centers for Neo-Thomist studies at Louvain, Paris, Fribourg and Salzburg. He interested himself personally in the foundation of the Catholic University of America. He encouraged scholars of all kinds. He revived in the Church enthusiasm for ideas.

In the realm of political principles Leo XIII repeated and emphasized the condemnations of his predecessors, but again, he was not content merely to condemn. In 1881 he laid down the doctrine of the Origin of Civil Power in an encyclical which has not yet been published in English. In two further encyclicals, *Immortale Dei* (1885) and *Libertas* (1888), he insisted that democracy is as compatible with Catholic philosophy and tradition as any other way of life: and that real personal liberty, which he called "God's most precious gift to man" and which is poles apart from the sectarian Liberalism of his age, has its firmest base and surest support in Catholicism. Leo's aim was to Christianize democracy and liberty.

In 1891 came the encyclical by which he is best known, on the condition of the working classes. Leo's teaching has become since that encyclical part of the stuff of Catholic sociology. Class is not by nature

hostile to class. Labour is not a commodity. Private property is a natural right. The family is of key importance. The father of a family has an inalienable right to a living family wage. He went on to sketch the Christian constitution of states, the duties of Catholic citizens, the rights and duties of both Church and State.

Leo's teaching was a complete whole, not lopsided by an insistence on only one aspect of man's life. We have, for example, his condemnation of the title "Christian Socialism" as a contradiction in terms. We have his great letter in 1893 on the study of Holy Scripture, his grand dogmatic encyclicals on the Holy Ghost, the Sacred Heart, the Blessed Eucharist, and his continued insistence on prayer to Our Blessed Lady and the use of the Holy Rosary. It is important today to remember every side of

Pope Leo's work. His outlook was truly Catholic and his insistence was on the whole of human life. He wrote an encyclical on the condition of the working classes: he wrote no less than four which deal directly with political life and the basis of civil order and authority.

For the moment sectarian Liberalism was in retreat. There was a strong return, for a time at least, of conservative forces. And yet already in the growing control of the State over so many aspects of individual life there was the shadow of a grave menace for the future—a menace which was always implicit in the Liberal doctrine—a menace underlined by Leo himself, proclaiming that the outcome would be either chaos or tyranny. Europe was passing into the age which heralds the coming of the totalitarian state.

God Gives True Liberty

"Submission to God, submission to the Kingship of Christ—faith in His teaching, submission to His laws as the rule of our actions—this is the true 'liberation' that frees our minds from error, and our hearts from bestiality. It preserves society from degradation and self-destruction. This is the true cause of reason, of morality, of humanity. Only in this way can society find true peace, for peace is the tranquility of order. But order implies that everything is in its place. And God's place is the first place."—*George Vincent, S.J., in CATHOLIC REVIEW, Shanghai, China, June, 1949.*

The A.M.A. and Birth Control

JOSEPH L. MCGOLDRICK, M.D.

Reprinted from *The LINACRE QUARTERLY**

TO A group such as this, representing the leading Catholic doctors of the country, there is no question concerning the ethics of birth control. Therefore we can assume that we are all in agreement on the fact that birth control or contraception is morally bad. To all of us this is axiomatic but to many non-Catholics this is controversial. However, from this morally correct fact let us take up the expressions of the American Medical Association that have the approval of the Board of Trustees in reference to birth control.

At the A. M. A. meeting, June, 1937 at Atlantic City, N. J., the Committee on Contraception brought in their recommendations which were unanimously passed by the Board of Trustees. At that time there was considerable consternation due to the fact that the impression was formed that the A. M. A. had come out for Birth Control. In some cases this impression was due to incorrect information or misunderstanding of the facts. In order to avoid any confusion at this time I will quote the recommendations as they appeared in the *Journal* at that time (Vol. 108, No. 26, p. 2218).

1. That the A. M. A. take such action as may be necessary to make clear to the physicians their legal rights in relation to the use of contraceptives.

2. That the A. M. A. undertake the investigation of materials, devices and methods recommended or employed for the prevention of conception with a view to determining the physiological, chemical and biological properties and effects and that the results of such investigation be published for the information of the medical profession.

3. That the Council of Medical Education and Hospitals of the A. M. A. be requested to promote thorough instruction in our medical schools with respect to the various factors pertaining to fertility and sterility, due attention being paid to their positive as well as their negative aspects.

This sounds like meticulous legal construction and omits concrete expression of definition for or against birth control. Editorially, *The Journal of the A.M.A.*, in commenting on the recommendations, stated:

The Committee on Contraception presented a simple dignified report of its deliberations which was unanimously adopted by the House of Delegates. This places on the various Councils the responsibility for the examination of the products used in contraception. It recognizes also the necessity for teaching the scientific aspects of both fertility and sterility. It recommends that the doctors inform themselves concerning their legal rights and responsibilities in relation to the prevention of conception and it suggests that such practices be in regularly licensed clinics under medical control.

* 1438 South Grand Blvd., St. Louis 4, Mo., April, 1948

Notwithstanding the editorial comment the recommendations are somewhat vague concerning the real issue as to favoring or opposing birth control and naturally could give rise to wrong inferences.

However, the following year at the annual meeting, in an attempt to clear up a previous report or for some other reason, the Committee to Study Contraceptive Practices and Related Problems through its Chairman, Dr. Carl H. Davis, presented to the Board of Trustees, for submission to the House of Delegates, the following:

To the House of Delegates of the A.M.A.:

As a supplement to the report made to you in 1936 and 1937 your Committee on Contraceptive Practices asks your acceptance of the following statement:

It is not the function of the A.M.A. to tell physicians what therapeutic advice they shall offer patients. However, it has been the policy to investigate various procedures, devices and drugs and publish the results of studies in its official publication for the information of the profession.

The instructions to the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry and the Council on Physical Therapy to investigate further the materials, devices and procedures used for the purpose of contraception do not indicate any change in the usual policy of the Association nor do they constitute an endorsement by the Association of contraceptive practices. (Vol. 110, No. 18, p. 1479.)

In considering the recommendation of the Committee on Contraceptive Practices from the moral aspect, I feel the legal rights of the physician

in relation to the use of contraception should, and must, be in conformity with the moral law. Any physician who advises the use of contraceptives is fully cognizant of the fact that he is attempting to frustrate the sexual act and needs no legal pronouncement to give him sanction. A legal right opposed to a moral right presents an anomalous situation; a legal right presupposes a moral right.

BAD EFFECTS

On the second recommendation regarding an investigation of the devices etc. employed for the prevention of conception—such an investigation should be provocative of excellent results. Too frequently we hear that such things are harmless, yet in looking through the literature we find such articles as, "Mold infection of the Vagina from Contraceptive jellies," "Trauma and infection from Gold stem pessary," "Vulva Dermatitis from Condom" etc. Further under "Queries and Minor Notes" in *The Journal of the A. M. A.* Vol. 108, No. 5, p. 413 in reference to the use of intrauterine silver rings we find the following answer: "All intrauterine devices are a source of danger to a woman even though introduced under strict antiseptic conditions into a uterus believed to be free from infection at the time." And it continues, "Everyone who has done much obstetrics and gynecologic practice has seen patients illustrating the bad effects of these devices and their inefficiency as contraceptives." In passing, I might add years ago after delivering a patient, in the routine

examination of the placenta, I removed a gold stem pessary imbedded in the placenta. Others have claimed that malignancies have resulted from the use of these mechanical devices. I am confident that such an investigation if carried out honestly and thoroughly by individuals not biased by preconceived notions will reveal considerable information contrary to the claims of the contraceptists and commercial firms.

Concerning instruction with respect to the various factors pertaining to fertility and sterility much can be gained. The fertile and sterile couple are the ever present problems to the gynecologist and obstetrician. In these branches up to date the surface has hardly been scratched; our knowledge is haphazard or more or less hit or miss. The sterile couples present a sad story; their feeling of remorse and anxiety presents itself in the question "Do you think the birth control we used is responsible?" At present no doctor can answer that question based on facts, but the experience of many would lead them to answer in the affirmative. The need for such information and instruction is imperative if acquired and disseminated under medical auspices and in accordance with ethical principles.

As a result of the legal and scientific approach, with the accent on approach, to the important question of contraception back in 1937 and the supplementary letter or negative report in 1938, much is left to be desired. The definite stand which has been sought is still held in abeyance. In view of the years that have elapsed

since 1936, dodging the issue or reluctance to express an opinion seems to be a conspicuous factor in the deliberations of the Association. This can be corrected by a definition by the Board of Trustees.

As a result of this lack of a positive statement medical colleges in their lectures to students concerning birth control assert that certain devices and drugs employed in the prevention of conception have the *imprimatur* of the A. M. A. If the Association is maligned by such teaching methods and such reference, this can be corrected by a positive assertion of the Board of Trustees.

MUST COMBAT THEORY AND PRACTICE

The Board of Trustees has had the question of birth control under advisement for a number of years and during this time has accumulated scientific and legal facts together with facts based on extensive experience. They have the expressed views of Winston Churchill on the drastic effects of birth control in England, Henri Giraud on the effects in France, Stalin's about-face on birth control and facts on population decline due to birth control in our country prior to the Civil War. Together with these they have the repeatedly expressed views of the Pontiffs based on material reasons as well as moral principles. Supported by such irrefutable facts there should be no delay by the Board of Trustees in expressing themselves positively and without evasion against contraception. While waiting

for this pronouncement, Catholic physicians should stimulate action in their Guilds to combat the theory and practice of contraception and oppose any form of municipal, State or Federal assistance for the promotion of contraception. There is no doubt that there is a strong and concerted effort on the part of a large group to get a government program across and their

ambition is to get the backing of the American Medical Association. It is due to the efforts of a few that the association has been rightly influenced not to succumb to the contraceptive pressure. The few should not have to do it alone but must be reinforced by the coordinated support of all the Physicians' Guilds, and the time to act is now.



The Power of a Man

"A man is still the wonder of the world. Machines draw the ends of the earth together in a day's journey. Machine eyes of telescopes look out over the abyss of space to star worlds, time years away. Machines tear matter apart and record the heart beats of a minnow. Great and all as they are, machines are made by man.

"Man is a creator. It is a man's eyes behind the telescope that look into the invisible world of light. The atomic bomb is after all a bigger hammer in a man's hand. The X-rays illuminate the darkest areas of disease but a man's mind reads the diagnosis.

"Man has built wide and deep and high, but nothing that he builds is greater than himself. All power under God is given to him but he can make nothing better than himself.

"Colleges, States, religious reforms, political movements, every institution that enlivens the human mind or heals the body is the length and breadth of some man's soul. Of these men who set up the foundations of our civilization, nearly all of them were poor, scarcely one of them in his life time was distinguished, almost all of them, sometime, lay under the shadow of disloyalty to the established order.

"Thomas More, Thomas Jefferson, Francis of Assisi, Abraham Lincoln, Pasteur and Vincent de Paul, profoundly moved the world to look up and move on. These men were eye openers, letting in the light on closed minds. In the most ancient and most accurate sense they were Seers. By their insight we see that the most important thing on earth is a man, every man, any man, his needs, his hopes, his final end."—*Don Capellano in LABOR LEADER, June 18, 1949.*

My Conversion to the Catholic Faith

MOST REV. DUANE G. HUNT, D.D.

Bishop of Salt Lake

*Reprinted from The EPISTLE**

THE facility with which some converts have described the processes by which they found their way to the Catholic Church has always amazed me and aroused a certain feeling of envy. For my own part, it has invariably been a difficult assignment to sit down and attempt to detail the story of my approach to the Church. In the first place, and I say this without any illusion of false humility, it is not a particularly stirring or important story. In the second place, I confess to a certain distaste for advertising my personal adventure in grace. There doubtless emerges the irreducible puritan in my make-up. But if the narrative, for all its lack of the spectacular, may serve as aid and comfort for those embarked on the same pilgrimage I made so many years ago, that is reason enough for embalming it in print.

I was born in the very heart of American Protestantism, the Middle West in the '80s of the last century. It is hard for me to estimate, much less to put in writing, the debt I owe my parents. They gave me a good home; they set before me a constant example of plain living and honest thinking. Devout Methodists, their faith was untinged with fanaticism,

and they stood four-square for all those principles of fundamental Christianity upon which the nation itself had been built and preserved through the ordeal of the Civil War which was still a living memory to them.

With my hand in my mother's I was introduced as a youngster to the mysteries of Sunday School. Vivid memories of those days survive, colored by the Bible stories conned and repeated, the prints and the chromos which were a part of the familiar apparatus. As I advanced in years, I was introduced to the regular church services, and at some date, in my early 'teens, I formally "joined the Church."

During this period of unclouded faith, what were my beliefs? As closely as I can clarify them now, they would seem to have been straightforwardly and typically Christian. There was certainly no question as to the existence and spirituality of God. With equal certitude I accepted the divinity of Jesus Christ, though it may well have been that an analysis of my belief would have revealed its imprecision and lack of any positive intellectual basis. As for the Bible, my respect for it was profound. It

* 4 E. 73rd St., New York 21, N. Y., Winter, 1940

was the word of God, the source of divine instruction and guidance for the human race. Unhesitatingly I would have avowed my belief in its inspiration, though what I would have meant by that term is something that recollection fails to indicate. In a word, during my adolescent years I was an avowed and professing Protestant, a thorough conformist.

That there was such a thing as the Catholic Church, I was, of course, dimly aware. My childhood and youth were passed without any more contact with the actual Church than my acquaintance with a single Catholic family, though fortunately the example there was solidly edifying. By-passing this exception, however, I swallowed in its entirety the general verdict of my friends and associates, that Catholics were people on a lower social level than ourselves, ignorant and inferior, held in durance vile by the evil machinations of the hierarchy. Some day, unquestionably, their emancipation would come (emancipation was still a word to conjure with) and they would all become good and enlightened Protestants.

DEVASTATING ANALYSIS

With the sophomorphism of youth I condemned the Church as hopelessly out of date and obscurantist. Quite possibly the first centuries of Christianity were blameless, though my ignorance of the history of the early Church was appalling. Sometime in later centuries, it goes without saying, the Church had yielded to corruption of the worst kind, and had

fallen into the hands of leaders who were tyrannical, cruel and despotic. Hints of the Spanish Inquisition provided the lurid background, and there was always the convenient figure of Pope Alexander VI. Against this nightmare of religious degradation, I reasoned, an enlightened Europe had at last revolted. Where the Church retained some semblance of her power, there the same old evils were continued. My contempt was particularly marked, good democratic-republican that I was, for the monarchical powers of Catholic officialdom. This was the negation of the democratic ideal, and the mainspring of the utter servility of Catholics everywhere. My analysis was devastating, and made up in cocksureness what it lacked in originality.

It is interesting to recall now the strength of my dislike for the ceremonial of the Catholic Church, especially since at the time my acquaintance with that phase of the liturgy was entirely theoretical. But from what I had heard, it was easy to denounce it out of hand as a relic of empty formalism. Never having met or even seen a priest, my judgment bore heavily upon the reputed greed of all who wore the Roman collar, upon their alleged habit of charging for confessions and upon the dubiousness of their morals generally. I should add that few of these prejudices were derived from my parents themselves. They did not like the Catholic Church, but they refrained from back-stairs gossip.

With this as my religious frame of reference I went to college. This was

a sound Methodist institution in the heart of Iowa, the type of school that believed in fundamental education and instilled precepts of severe self-discipline. As I recall my freshman year, it was a period of quiescence; there was little that disturbed the even tenor of my theological prepossessions. For myself, as for the majority of my fellow-students, there was the smug assurance that Protestantism was the only possible way of life, offering as it seemed to do the maximum of security in the relatively untroubled world of the early 20th century. We would emerge, unquestionably, as the anointed leaders of our communities, the continental Pharisees. I cannot remember any particular religious fervor as a characteristic of my life during this phase, but simply a bland satisfaction with things as they were.

RUMBLINGS OF DOUBT

To the best of my recollection, it must have been somewhere along the course of my second year in college that the first rumblings of doubt began to make themselves heard in the recesses of my mind. The original source of the disturbance was the "Revival," which was then, and for many years thereafter, an accepted feature of Mid-Western Protestantism. The recurrence of these periodic religious orgies began to arouse my distaste, and it was not long until they awakened an active disgust. They began to impress me as crude and sensational, quite the opposite of anything I could conceive as a fitting expression of Christianity, and cer-

tainly as an unstable and highly emotional method of confessing religious convictions. If this were actually the substance of religion, I thought, and its effect on me was so adverse, perhaps there was something lacking in my approach. These musings, half-formulated, continued to bother me, though I shared my disturbance with none of my companions in college.

As time went on, moreover, my difficulties became greater. Other features of the popular Protestantism of the day began to annoy me. There was, for example, the matter of extemporaneous prayers, and there was the exasperating practice of "giving testimony." Attendance at Sunday morning services and the weekly prayer meetings, punctuated with these usages, became increasingly obnoxious. Impromptu prayers, as I analyzed them, seemed to specialize in informing God about what was going on, information which surely He did not need; the testimonies, "see what God has done for me," impressed me as a macabre kind of boasting. Neither struck me as reverent or properly humble . . .

The story of my religious discontent would not be complete without at least a brief reference to my reaction to the puritanism with which I was surrounded. There were the so-called "questionable amusements," for instance, such as card playing and dancing. I was brought up in the belief that to take part in them was wrong and unChristian. It was a matter of conscience. Even in college such was the current interpretation

of Christianity. At first, as in all other departments of thinking and behavior, I was a strict conformist, and a sincere one. It was only a matter of time, however, until the denunciation of "questionable amusements," following other and more important features of my religious environment, should come in for its share of criticism and challenge. It may well be that the puritanism of my locality was not fully in accord with Protestant theology; I don't know about that. All I knew was that, practically speaking, the Christian religion was closely bound up and identified with prohibitions. It appeared as a composite of negations.

DISILLUSIONMENT

In the same category was my disapproval, once I started to disapprove, of the prevailing attitude toward even moderate indulgence in tobacco and liquor. This, too, was prescribed as unChristian. As an illustration of the extremes to which such thinking can be carried, I recall the insistence of some of my associates that the wine served at the marriage feast of Cana and the Last Supper was merely grape juice. To the reader of these lines it seems incredible that such an opinion could be held in college circles. It was so held, however, and was passed on to me in all seriousness. Need I add that disillusionment was inevitable?

As a college junior, my dissatisfaction became so keen that I could no longer refrain from seeking counsel. The faculty members and ministers whom I approached were uniformly

kindly in their response, but their answers never satisfied me. Even so, my desire to remain within the bounds of conformity, my sense of loyalty to all that I considered my heritage, demanded that I make the best effort I could to accept the proffered solutions.

Some of my questions come to mind. What does it mean to say that "Jesus saves?" I hear my fellow students testify that they have been saved: How do they know? I hear them declare that they have chosen Jesus as their "personal Saviour": What can such a statement mean? Are "questionable amusements" sinful? If so, why? What is my status relative to the Church? Who has authority to tell me that I am bound to attend church services? Who put the books of the Bible together? How do I know that they were inspired? How does it happen that the same Bible is the seed-bed of so many contradictory doctrines? Why cannot religious truth be easily recognized?

Granted that these questions were clumsily stated and were far from boasting analytic maturity, still they embodied the doubts which tortured me. The Protestant critic of today might well say that my failure to find satisfaction in the solutions suggested by my advisers reflected rather upon my judgment than upon the answers themselves. He might insinuate, with some degree of accuracy, that for a young man I was too introspective, that I did not expose my mind with sufficient candor. All I can say is that these doubts and difficulties were painfully real to me. They were

mere passing phase of restless youth. If my mentors in college did not grasp the depth of my disturbance, neither did I myself. I was floundering in what Bossuet has called the "variations" of Protestantism, and I could discover no anchor-hold for my wavering faith.

This was a time of acute spiritual distress. I continued my attendance at the regular services, but my attitude was hardening into one of contemptuous tolerance. Probably the only thing that attracted me to church at all was my pleasure in singing. The sermons and testimonials I sat through with grim cynicism; the extemporaneous prayers I endured with ill-concealed ridicule and scorn. Christianity itself had ceased to evoke my reverence. Doubtless I was conceited and altogether too cocky, a very disagreeable young man going through a very disagreeable experience. However, I kept my thoughts to myself, unwilling to put them into words. They were too frightening. I sat back, detached, fretful and worried.

A temporary interruption of my college course gave me an opportunity to recoup my finances by accepting a teaching position. This brought me to a small Iowa community where there was a Catholic Church. Probably for no other reason than absorption in my own religious problem I found myself reading some of the stock volumes of Catholic apologetics, obtained from newly found Catholic friends. Quite vividly do I recall my first reaction to Cardinal Gibbons's well-known

Faith of Our Fathers. I read it, though it is doubtful if the book has ever had a more supercilious reader. Its conclusions I dismissed summarily; the Catholic Church was false and had to be false. The thought never crossed my mind that she might have something to offer me; she was the last place I would have considered as a source of truth. Nevertheless, I read on, and in some undefinable way was impressed.

As I look back on those days I remember thinking how utterly foolish it was for anyone to attempt any sort of defense of the Church on the basis of facts or logical deductions, and wondering how on earth this prelate, Cardinal Gibbons, could have the effrontery to try it. Still and all, the questions he posed were questions that had been disturbing me, and the answers he gave, as I reluctantly admitted, seemed to fill the bill. Because they were Catholic answers, they had to be wrong, but there they were, in black and white, and they held my attention.

TOO LOGICAL

The chain of Catholic reasoning annoyed me by its clever linking of fact with fact, deduction with deduction. There was the divinity of Christ, the establishment of a Church by Him, and the conclusion that the Church so founded could never disappear and could not teach error. If the linking was genuine, then the Church must be Christ's Church, authorized to teach me. But, of course, I stoutly maintained, there had to be the flaw. However inevitable the logic, the con-

clusion could not follow, because my first and last premise was that the Catholic Church was ruled out of court. Not even to myself would I admit that my reading had made a deep and lasting impression upon me. I scoffed at myself for bothering with the Catholic claims at all, but even as I scoffed the fascination grew upon me.

All the bigoted charges that I had ever heard against the Church came back to mind to reinforce my resistance. She was the Scarlet Woman, an imposter, corrupt, even diabolical. Far from being attracted to her, I knew I ought to resent, with all my power, her very existence as an insult to human nature. If, among her impostures, her logic intrigued me, then it was up to me to expose its basic fallacy.

I suppose it must have been at this time that I found myself, one day, actually reasoning in reverse. Since the Church, *a priori*, was false, and inasmuch as I was unable to disprove her foundation by Christ, then it followed that Christ Himself must have been a mere human being, and a misguided one, at that. He could not have been divine, otherwise the Church of His making could not have failed, as it obviously had. Such reverse reasoning pushed me to a denial of Our Lord's divinity. No longer a bumptious collegian, I could not be happy about this denial, for it brought a clean break with all Christianity, with the things for which I still retained an unconscious reverence.

If Christ were not God why should

I be interested in Christianity, a merely human religion? My mind turned momentarily to the religion of the Chosen People; was there anything there to hold me? The answer came quickly. If Christ and His transcendental claims were false, there was nothing in Judaism that could claim my allegiance. Similarly, the most cursory glance at the other religious systems of mankind sufficed to justify their abrupt dismissal. I felt myself drifting, drifting into skepticism if not into positive atheism. The very ground seemed insecure beneath my feet; my faith in everything seemed to totter. Yet all this while, and the experience continued through several years, I continued, quite inconsistently, though I hope not hypocritically, to attend Protestant Church services. It was a way of trying to force myself to hold on, in the desperate hope that some salvation might be held out for me.

TRUTH'S KEY

Sheer honesty compelled me, ultimately, to face squarely the root problem of Christ's divinity. As I review, at this long remove, the process of my study, with the limited and imperfect means I had at my disposal, the wonder is, not that I reached the correct answer, but that I was able to reach any answer at all. It is quite clear to me now that the grace of God was guiding me through the inadequacies of my equipment and the pitfalls of my imperfect theology to a definite intellectual conviction of the Godhead of Jesus Christ. This was, at any rate, the outcome of my

study, the first and firm step along the road. For me, I concluded, Christ was indeed the Emmanuel, the Incarnate Word. He had come into the world to teach, to guide and to save me, and I was bound to believe what He had taught, bound to obey whatsoever He had commanded, bound to worship Him according to His own terms.

There was no escaping the inevitability of the logic which, once more, brought me squarely up against the Catholic Church. I had to believe in Christ, but, with something bordering on frenzy, I still sought to find a way not to believe in the Church He had founded. I was looking for a comfortable middle course, one that would be Christian but not Catholic.

My struggles to find that way continued for several years after graduation from college, during most of which time I was teaching in the public schools of Iowa. Here are some of the things I did in my anxiety to escape from the impasse in my thinking. On one occasion I remember browsing in a book-store in a large city, and with a small-town youth's respect for learning of the metropolis, asking the attendant for books on the Catholic Church. I was shown several typical works of apologetics, but I explained hastily that I wanted something against the Church—the strongest to be had. I purchased the books that were offered, hurried home and read them eagerly. They left me completely cold.

On another occasion I called on the pastor of the Protestant church I was attending at the time. I asked

him to let me sing in the choir and to keep me so busy with other activities that I would have no time to worry about the Catholic claims, hoping to discover eventually that they were only a passing illusion. He tried, and I believe I can honestly say that I tried, but it was of no use.

PARTING OF FRIENDS

Again, I found myself at a summer encampment of the YMCA, at Lake Geneva, at which prominent Protestant leaders were scheduled to speak and hold conferences. By appointments I called on several of these men, and presented my problem with the distinct plea that they would show me the way to "keep out of the Catholic Church." Their answers were varied. Some were patient with me and evidently concerned over my state of mind; others were casual and offhand; one of them ordered me from his presence. I left more discouraged than before.

Naturally enough, my friends were apprehensive. While I kept my questioning to myself as much as possible, it was inevitable that some echoes of my struggle should reach them. In all good faith, I am sure, they did their best to head me off, supplying me with even more horrendous disclosures of the evils of Rome than the bookstore had furnished me. I do not recall now if they descended to Maria Monk, but Père Hyacinth was a fairly recent discovery in those days, along with Alfred Loisy and others of the current Modernist dissenting group. Alas, they were wasting their efforts so far as I was con-

cerned. With ever waning hope, I still consulted men I felt I could trust, ministers and former college professors; always the result was the same, a growing feeling of the inevitability of the step which I yet refused to take.

CHRIST OR CHAOS

It was out of such processes of thinking that I was ultimately brought squarely up against a startling question: Is there nothing between the Catholic religion and atheism? If the former is rejected does the latter become inevitable? Is there no middle ground? Is the Catholic faith the only way of saving me from the loss of all faith and the repudiation of all religion? Is it God's way of saving me and all other men from cynicism and despair? The answer was unescapable. With conclusive finality I admitted to myself that there was nothing between Christ and chaos, nothing between the Catholic faith and atheism.

The realization then struck me that I had been playing the part of a coward. Why should I be afraid of the Catholic Church? If facts and logic converged upon her, if reason demanded her as the answer to my problems, why should I allow my worn-out prejudices to stand in the way? I made up my mind to be fully honest with myself, to face the realities of the situation without flinching. The moment I made that resolution the doubts disappeared. As I was to learn later, I had begun to cooperate with the grace of God.

It was then, as I remember in clear

detail, that I reviewed once more the whole process of my thinking. Starting all over again, I set down the premises which were undebatable. As though it were yesterday, I recall sketching my analysis: I believe in God; I need to be taught the truths which He wishes me to believe; since Christ is God and came on earth to teach me this truth, it is to Him I must look. But how does Christ teach me? There could be, I answered, only three ways: 1. By direct and personal revelation; 2. Through a written record (the Sacred Scriptures); 3. Through the agency of men, that is, through an organization commissioned by Him for that purpose.

THIRD ANSWER

Did Christ, I asked, teach me by direct revelation? Not that I was aware. Furthermore, if, in spite of this insensitiveness on my part, He really had chosen this means, then He must teach all men in the same way. Honesty of intention and the sincere desire to hear His voice would be the only prerequisites. But how, then, could the fact be explained away that so many men of obvious and unquestionable good will held so many and such contradictory beliefs? With a gesture of finality, I discarded the first possibility.

Did He teach me through the Bible? Here was old ground, well-trodden, thoroughly mulled over. But how was I to know that it was the Bible, the inspired record of God's dealings with men? Perhaps it contained much spurious matter; perhaps its canon was uncertain, books

left out which should have been retained, books incorporated which should be rejected. Again, how could I know the real meaning of the many disputed passages? There were, I reminded myself, over two hundred religious groups all claiming the Bible as their font and origin, all asserting their particular interpretations as correct. My common sense repeated, what I already knew, that Christ must have appointed some agent to compose the Sacred Scripture and to interpret its meaning for all men.

Why should I gag, then, at considering calmly and dispassionately the possibility of the third answer, even if it led directly to the Catholic Church? Who else could this appointed teacher be? What could she be but infallible? My right to certitude was as great as that of the fortunate few who heard the Master speak, who saw Him pass along the way. And if He was in truth divine, and if He had appointed His agents to teach and govern and sanctify in His name, He could not help but make them share His infallibility. I needed no Biblical texts to bolster my assurance that His Church was founded upon a rock; it could not be otherwise. Her infallibility was as inevitable and as unescapable as His own. It was His own.

COMPLETE TEACHER

As I look back upon my thinking of those days, I recall that I was not much interested in particular doctrines. I gave little thought to the doctrine about the Confessional, for instance, or purgatory, or prayers for

the dead, or the Eucharist, or the resurrection of the body, or the jurisdiction of the Pope, or other Catholic doctrines which seemed to disturb Protestants of those days. My thought was centered in Christ and His Church. If He was divine and if He established a Church, neither of which facts I could any longer doubt, then it followed that I was bound to be a member of that Church and to believe what she taught. I must accept the doctrines of the Church precisely because they were doctrines of the Church.

So it was that at last I took the step toward which all my thinking had pointed through six years of troubled doubting and distress of soul. Finding myself in Chicago, in the autumn of 1912, enrolled in the law school of the University of Chicago, I sought out the nearest Catholic rectory, Saint Thomas the Apostle. I introduced myself to the priest who met me in the parlor, Reverend Michael Shea, and asked for admission into the Catholic Church, expressing my eagerness to take all the instructions which were required. My time for reading was limited, but the fundamentals were already so fixed in my mind that all the rest followed with the ease of completing a picture-puzzle once the key had been discovered. I am afraid I was a somewhat disappointing convert to my instructor. My battles were all over before I had rung his door-bell.

My baptism (January 1913) was a private ceremony, witnessed by the priest and my sponsor only. My first Communion at an early Mass the next

morning likewise was unnoticed, as I expected and wished. No one was interested in what I was doing. My coming into the Catholic Church was unannounced. It attracted no attention; it deserved none.

PRIEST AND BISHOP

The rest of my story, being aside from the purpose of this present writing, may be dismissed with a few words. Sometime in the spring of 1913 I signed up to teach in the University of Utah, in Salt Lake City. When I came here in the fall of that same year I had not the slightest expectation that from then on my life would be set in Utah. The only plan I had, in so far as I can remember, was to teach here a year or two and then take more post-graduate work in my newly chosen department, that of Public Speaking, looking to some higher scholastic degrees.

It was soon apparent, however, that God and my own inclinations had charted an entirely different course for me. One day I was suddenly aware of a discovery, the discovery that the only thing that I was really interested in was the Catholic religion. I thought about it; talked about it, whenever I could find a listener; I read about it; I consulted

priests to learn more about it; I was deeply concerned about its welfare; I wished to be a factor in its progress. I found myself impatient with non-Catholics, amazed that they could resist the magnificent appeal and logical claims of the Church. Perhaps, I said to myself, if I could state clearly and correctly the position of the Church, perhaps some day I could win other converts to her fold. Here was a new challenge. Together with the realization that the Catholic Church meant more to me than anything and everything else in the world it led me to the necessity of another decision.

This time I made no effort to resist the will of God. After a reasonable period of testing myself, necessary for certainty, I called on the Bishop of Salt Lake, the Most Reverend Joseph S. Glass, C.M., D.D., and asked to be adopted as a seminarian. Being accepted, I was sent to Saint Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, California, where I studied under the Sulpician Fathers. I was ordained in June of 1920 for the Diocese of Salt Lake. It would seem that the facts of my life as a priest should give a convincing answer to the question of whether I have found my way home.

Faith Plus Works

"It is true that if we believe in Christ we will be saved. But we have to live according to our belief in Christ. The only kind of Christ we know is the Christ of the Gospels, the Christ who taught a hard doctrine about taking up our cross daily and following Him."—*T. S. Siekmann in THE PRIEST, Huntington, Ind., August, 1949.*

The Church and Labor

BENJAMIN L. MASSE, S.J.

THROUGHOUT the length and breadth of our country the nation pauses today to honor the millions of men and women in the ranks of labor.

It is most appropriate that we do so. Without the skills and industry of our workers, we would not be today the richest and most powerful country in the world. We would not have that abundance of material things—of conveniences and comforts as well as necessities—which makes life in America more pleasant and agreeable than it is anywhere else in the world. Without the contribution of our workers, we would not be able at this grim moment in history, through the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact, to check the swelling tide of totalitarian slavery and strike a mighty blow for human dignity and freedom. The millions of men and women who daily take up their stations in our stores and mines and factories, on our farms, our ships, our trucks and trains are the most precious wealth this nation has. What more fitting then than to set aside a day in their honor; to have the President and the Governors of the various States thank them in the name of all the people for their contribution to the general welfare; to honor them in the various ways which have become traditional among us.

It is especially fitting that we do this in these latter days, since there

Sermon delivered at a Labor Day Mass, sponsored by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, at the National Guard Armory, Gary, Ind., September 5, 1949.

was a time when the nation neglected its workers, when it permitted the rich and powerful to oppress and exploit them, when it forgot the fundamental, all-important fact that the most significant feature of economic activity is the personal dignity of the human beings who engage in it. A half-century ago, one of the greatest of all the successors of Peter, the Apostle, bitterly complained that "a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself." We can all be thankful this morning that many of the abuses which Pope Leo XIII criticized in 1891 have long since been remedied. To the extent that we have protected by law the tender age of children and the physical weakness of women; that we have the Wages and Hours Act, workmen's compensation, factory inspection laws, unemployment insurance, the Social Security Act and other enlightened legislation, we have a more Christian economic and social order than the one our fathers and mothers knew. Had he lived to see the changes which the nineteen-thir-

ties brought, the Pope of the Workingmen would have rejoiced and given thanks to God; as indeed, his successors, notably Pope Pius XI and the present Holy Father, have publicly done.

There are, as you know, men who, if they heard the statement I have just made, would sneer at it and say that it is not true. They tell us that religion is the opium of the people, that the churches are allied with the rich against the poor, that at the present time the Pope is leagued with Wall Street against Soviet Russia and against the so-called "Peoples' Democracies" which the Kremlin has imposed on the once free peoples of Eastern Europe.

It is scarcely necessary to tell you that in an age when the "Big Lie" has become the normal expedient of totalitarian governments, these are the biggest lies of all.

CRUSADE AGAINST RUSSIA

To begin with the most recent communist charge, that the Church has joined Wall Street in a crusade against the Soviet Empire. You know very well, those of you who belong to a trade union, that both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations are supporting the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. They are supporting these moves strongly and enthusiastically, in deeds as well as words. They do not regard Soviet Russia as the friend of the working class but as its most dangerous and deadly enemy. Both here and abroad they are struggling to break the chainscarpenter's bench in Nazareth—that

which conniving communists have succeeded in fastening on some trade unions, striving to restore these unions to the world of free labor. That is the meaning of the CIO's break with the now communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions. That is the meaning of the current effort, supported by both the AFL and CIO, to build a new world federation of free trade unions. If the Church is fighting, with purely spiritual weapons, the totalitarian tyranny of the Kremlin, as she most certainly is, she is doing so not in the company of Wall Street, but side by side with the trade unions of the United States and with free trade unions everywhere. Mindszenty, Stepinac and Beran are not the servants of the almighty dollar; in their loyalty to God they are martyrs to the freedom and dignity of every man and woman in the world.

There is no more substance to the accusation that the Church is the friend of the rich and the enemy of the poor than there is to the lying charge that she has joined Wall Street in a war against Russia.

Remember, we are talking about the Church now, not about some individual priest or bishop here and there. It is quite possible that there are some priests who are not sympathetic to organized labor; who look at its faults with a magnifying glass and see its virtues through smoked spectacles; who have so far forgotten the Divine Model whom they are supposed to imitate—the Divine Model who spent most of His adult life at a

they tend to identify the interests of the Church with the interests of the rich.

Such priests are not the Church, nor are they in any way typical of the priesthood. Archbishop Cushing told a union convention some years ago that of all the members of the American hierarchy there was not a single one whose parents had a college education. The priesthood of the Church is largely recruited from the poor, from people who are not afraid to have families or to give their sons and daughters to the service of Almighty God. The Church in the United States has been accused of a good many crimes and misdemeanors; but she has never, thank God, been called a "fashionable" church. She is identified with the masses of the people, not with high society, and in this she glories. The rich and the poor, the ignorant and learned, the working man and his employer cannot always in this country meet on a level of equality. One of the few places where they can so meet is a Catholic church.

If we want to know what the Church thinks, then, of capitalism, or trade unionism, or social legislation, we must go to those who speak with authority—to the Pope and the Bishops. I need not recall the great encyclical letter of Leo XIII, "On the Condition of the Working Classes," or the equally famous letter of Pope Pius XI, "On the Reconstruction of the Social Order." I trust that these documents are familiar to you; that you read and reread them; that in their truly radical teachings, as radi-

cal as the Gospel of Christ, you seek the solutions to many of the problems which still perplex us. This morning I would call your attention to a statement by our American Bishops which deserves to be better known than it is.

BISHOPS' PROGRAM

Thirty years ago this great nation was engaged in healing the wounds of World War I and building a basis for peace. The spirit of reform was in the air and all sorts of groups were striving zealously to chart the course of the future. One of these groups was the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic War Council, the organization established by the American Bishops to collaborate with the Government during the first world war, and which later became the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The members of the Administrative Committee were Bishops Muldoon, of Rockford, Schrembs of Toledo, Hayes of New York and Russel of Charleston.

On February 12, 1919, this Committee issued a statement which began with the words:

The ending of the Great War has brought peace. But the only safeguard of peace is social justice and a contented people. The deep unrest so emphatically and so widely voiced throughout the world is the most serious menace to the future peace of every nation and of the entire world. Great problems face us. They cannot be put aside; they must be met and solved with justice to all.

The Bishops proposed to meet these problems, and to meet them head on.

They did so with such brilliance and understanding that the "Bishops' Program," as it came to be called, overshadowed in the public mind most of the other postwar programs and was soon the subject of lively debate. To a good many industrialists, as Cardinal Mooney noted twenty years after the event, the statement seemed "too radical," and a committee of the New York State Legislature actually criticized it as "socialistic." As a matter of fact, it was nothing more than a restatement of traditional Catholic social principles and a realistic application of those principles to the American economy. The Bishops formulated their teaching in the following eleven proposals:

1. Minimum wage legislation.
2. Insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity, and old age.
3. A sixteen-year minimum age limit for working children.
4. The legal enforcement of the right of labor to organize.
5. Continuation of the national War Labor Board, for this and other purposes affecting the relations of employers and employees.
6. A national employment service.
7. Public housing for the working classes.
8. No general reduction of war-time wages and a long distance program of increasing them, not only for the benefit of labor but in order to bring about that general prosperity which cannot be maintained without a wide distribution of purchasing power among the masses.
9. Prevention of excessive profits and incomes through a regulation of rates which allows the owners of public utilities only a fair rate of return on

their actual investment, and through progressive taxes on inheritance and income, and excess profits.

10. Participation of labor in management and a wider distribution of ownership through cooperative enterprises and worker ownership in the stock of corporations.

11. Effective control of monopolies, even by the method of government competition, if that should prove necessary.

In this day and age, with our Wages and Hours Act, our Social Security Act, our employment services, public housing and slum clearance laws, and with the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively legally guaranteed, it is scarcely necessary to comment on that program. It has stood the passage of time and the test of experience. In itself, it is a complete refutation of the charge that the Church is the enemy of the poor, that religion is the opium of the people. The only remarkable thing about it is that it was so far ahead of its times. Almost everything the Bishops recommended on that February day thirty years ago, the nation has since adopted in whole or in part.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION

The only exception to this is the Bishops' proposal for greater cooperation between workers and employers, a cooperation that looked beyond collective bargaining to the participation of labor in management and in ownership. There has been very little progress here and indications are that there will not be very much more in the immediate future.

This is regrettable. It is regrettable because the need for unity and harmony between labor and management is scarcely less pressing today than it was during the war. We are living in a dangerous world. Everywhere the freedom which we love, and which flows from our dignity as sons of God, is under attack. Because our country is the most powerful nation in the world, because it escaped the physical destruction of war, it has been forced to assume the leadership of the remaining free nations in their death struggle with the new barbarism from the east. We call this struggle the "cold war," but let us make no mistake about it. If we lose it, we shall lose our security and risk our independence just as surely as if we had lost a shooting war. Just as American production proved the decisive factor in the struggle against Nazi Germany, so a prosperous, productive America will turn the scales in the fight with Soviet Russia. That means teamwork between the men of labor and the men of management, a teamwork based on a spirit of fairness, on mutual respect, and on the knowledge that they are working together in a cause that is more important than their own respective interests, no matter how legitimate these may be.

There is another reason why we must regret the small progress that has been made in labor-management cooperation. As Christian men and women we do not believe in class hatred and class warfare. We reject the thesis that workers and employers are of necessity enemies. We be-

lieve in the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God, that brotherhood which was sanctified by Jesus Christ on Calvary. If there is hostility between labor and management, if there is a lack of trust and mutual respect, if there is no willingness to forget the past and build a better future, the reason is that workers and employers are leaving their religion behind when they enter the factory gate. That is something to worry about. It suggests that the law of love is not the law of business; that there is no place for Christ in American industry.

MANDATE OF JESUS CHRIST

We all have our ideas about where the responsibility for this lack of cooperation chiefly lies, and our ideas may not all be the same. This is not the time nor place to discuss questions of guilt, to reopen old sores that in many cases are slowly healing. It is the time and place to remind both workers and employers that their relations must be guided by the same Christian laws which govern all their other actions in life. And if there is any doubt about what these laws are, it is sufficient to recall the mandate of Jesus Christ: "As you would that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner." The Golden Rule, if sincerely practised, would settle more industrial disputes than all the conciliation services in the country. Better still, it would stop them before they had a chance to start.

One parting word. Your presence here this morning is an inspiring and

heartening sight. You Catholic workers have taken the day dedicated to you and in turn have dedicated it to Him Who was also a workingman. Let Christ, the Carpenter of Nazareth, be your guide and inspiration. You have much to contribute to the trade union movement. When there is any union work to be done, you should be the first to offer yourselves. If your fellows wish to honor you by electing you to office, you should not attempt to evade the responsibility. Above all, you should take an active and intelligent part in union affairs.

You should be present at meetings; you should familiarize yourselves with whatever issues arise. In casting your vote, you should be guided by what is right and just. You should support leaders who are honest, loyal, unselfish. In a word, you should be full-time citizens of your trade unions, striving always to make them powerful instruments of social justice, instruments dedicated to the well-being of workers, to the welfare of our country, and to the greater honor and glory of God. Anything less falls short of the Faith you profess.

The Christian Workingman

"The workingmen of my own neighborhood and experience appear to me to be the genuine brand which any workingman anywhere will instinctively recognize and acknowledge as his true fellow. His type is simple. He wants his fair share of the common welfare, as a matter of justice; but do not imagine that he is therefore obsessed with money-making as materialists are. He doesn't even want to be like those who set out to save him and raise him up: his sense of dignity is insulted by such patronizing. He just wants to be himself—his best self—a proper man, doing his conscientious share of work for a just return. And certainly, he does not want to be materially enriched at the cost of being impoverished and robbed of all those non-material, spiritual values. For those are the cherished things of heart, soul and spirit which he enjoys so easily and about which the clever intellectual reformers haven't the faintest notion.

"Look around you for this, the real workingman. See him amongst his family sharing their simple pleasures; watch him proudly and reliably doing his day's job; look at him living fully and with natural enjoyment amongst the many interests which enrich his free time, and mean more to him than gold or silver. Then banish forever from your mind that Marxian lie about the worker having nothing to lose but his chains. Perhaps the worker has more to lose than those of any other class."—*From Catholic Social Guild leaflet, Oxford, England.*

Anti-Semitism Under the Reds

THE REV. JOHN S. KENNEDY

Reprinted from COLUMBIA*

"AT LEAST they do not persecute Jews or in any way discriminate against them. In fact, they have strictly enforced laws against that sort of thing." Many a discussion of Soviet practice has been climaxed by such a statement. Nor has the statement always been made by a Jew. It has also been advanced by non-Jews who, in accord with the dictates of head and heart alike, abominate the shameful and brutal aberration which is anti-Semitism. For many years the assertion has gone unchallenged. And it has carried weight in any assessment of the Soviet system.

In the first place, it has carried weight with Jews. This is not because of any natural affinity between Judaism and Communism, as the vicious demagogue often alleges. Two years ago, in *Pageant* magazine, Eugene Lyons, who is a Jew and a most forceful opponent of Communism, exploded what he called "the myth of Jewish Communism." He proved that, at the time of the Revolution in Russia, incomparably more Jews were for a moderate, democratic government than for the Bolshevik dictatorship; that Jews have since been a distinct minority in the Soviet high command; and that in the United States only a handful of the millions of American Jews belong to the Communist party, a handful "disowned, disliked

and at best pitied by American Jewry as a whole."

Rather, as is easily understandable, some American Jews, while neither affiliated nor sympathetic with the Communist party, could not altogether condemn a regime which, whatever its patent faults, made anti-Semitism a crime. The same kind of thinking can be found among Catholics. Not a few of the latter are inclined to be lenient in judging a dubious government or ruler that outlaws persecution, official or unofficial, of their co-religionists. Jews have been subject to persecution or discrimination for a longer time and in far more places than have Catholics or members of any other group. It is therefore not in the least surprising that the Soviet regime should have got from them some good marks for formally reprobating anti-Semitism.

In the second place, non-Jews of a humanitarian cast of mind took at its face value the Soviet ban on anti-Semitism and interpreted it as a great step forward in the achieving of social peace. These people commendably opposed anti-Semitism and saw in it something irrational, cruel and divisive. They believed in reform by fiat and expected that decrees would change deeply rooted attitudes. And so they applauded a regime which,

* New Haven 7, Conn., July, 1949

by legislation, took measures against an intellectual error and a moral evil. In giving the Soviets credit for attacking, at least on the statute books, this error and this evil, they were singling out one ostensible improvement of a very signal kind from the welter of mistaken and disastrous principles and policies of the Soviets and highlighting the former while discounting the latter.

In any case, the Soviets' extremely well advertised opposition to anti-Semitism was, in argument, a point in their favor. But a relatively few thoughtful people looked behind the legislation to find out its true motivation and meaning. These thoughtful people suspected from the start that the Soviets sought to eliminate anti-Semitism *not* because the Soviets had any convictions as to the evil of anti-Semitism, but rather because they were determined to extirpate anything which might distinguish one individual from the next in the undifferentiated and servile mass which they sought to make of all men under their control. In other words, they attacked anti-Semitism because it marked out Jews as Jews. But whatever, good or evil, marked out individuals or groups as distinctive had to disappear, since the Soviets wanted a multitude of robots or cogs or digits, one as nearly like the next as possible.

Thus, while acting against anti-Semitism, the Soviets acted even more ruthlessly against whatever else served to mark out Jews as Jews. For example, when Stalin was Commissar of Nationalities in 1919, thirty years

ago, he prohibited all Jewish communes in the territory of the Soviet Union. Jews were forbidden to segregate themselves and were required to lose themselves in the generality. If they were allowed to have Jewish communes, they might, for example, preserve and practice their religion, but once separated they would be deprived of the community element so strong in religion. The Soviets were, of course, resolved to stamp out the Jewish religion, both as a religion (persecuted and destined for elimination like any other, in the Soviet plan) and as a force for marking out Jews as Jews.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

Hence, from the outset of the regime, the Jewish religion has been persecuted just as intensely and relentlessly as any other. When church property was seized, no exception was made in favor of synagogues. Hebrew, the liturgical language of the Jews, was proscribed. Rabbis were sent off to concentration and slave labor camps just as were priests. Victor Kravchenko, in *I Chose Freedom*, writes of a visit to a slave labor camp. "Who are those three men over there," he asked the camp chief. The three were "bearded men in tattered overcoats, their heads wrapped in shawls, who were working on a pile of stones." And the reply was: "Two priests and a rabbi. They're too weak to walk the eight kilometers to Kemerovo factories, but they're earning their bread doing chores in their camp." The chief referred to the priests and rabbi with

the same epithet, "counter-revolutionaries." No distinction was made. As religious leaders, they were all "enemies of the people," meaning that they believed in the supremacy of God and not that of the dictator.

That this reading of the motives and meaning of the Soviets' penalizing anti-Semitism was correct some tens of thousands of Polish Jews discovered to their cost during the late war. It is commonly alleged that anti-Semitism was endemic in pre-war Poland and, indeed, all but semi-official. Unquestionably it existed there, but that it had anything faintly resembling official sanction is debatable. It is notable that in a report made to the convention of the Jewish Labor Committee in Atlantic City last April, acknowledgment is made of what was permitted the Jews in Poland prior to 1939. "Jews have lived in Poland for more than a thousand years, and Jewish historians have justifiably called the Jewish community of Poland the heart of Jewry." In religion and culture the Jewish community in Poland *was* the heart of Jewry.

Poland was divided by Hitler and Stalin in 1939. Great numbers of Jews were thus incorporated in the Soviet Union, which fact was taken by the naive to mean that at long last their struggle against anti-Semitism was ending. For was not anti-Semitism a crime in the Soviet Union? Was not the Soviet Union regarded as that concrete Utopia where discrimination against Jews was unknown?

The Polish Jews who believed this

were quickly disillusioned. They found that they were now required to divest themselves of their identity as Jews. Their Jewish culture must go, their Jewish religion must go. They must cease to be Jews. As one of them incisively put it, Jews could not be Jews in the Soviet Union, and moreover there was persecution of them "as of all others" as men, as human beings. Hence the dominant thought, the burning desire of these people was to flee. Thousands of them managed it. If they could get to Palestine, they would like to do so. But they were willing and eager to live even in Germany, where the anti-Semitism drilled in by Hitler for a decade and a half still is not exorcised, in preference to the land where anti-Semitism is illegal.

TRUE SOVIET ATTITUDE

In concluding his newly published book, *The Stars Bear Witness*, Bernard Goldstein, who for almost sixty years was a socialist Jewish leader in Poland, writes:

About a quarter of a million [Polish Jews] had fled to the Soviet Union as refugees during the war; approximately 150,000 returned. When the Russian Government offered them Soviet citizenship very few had accepted—not because the old life in Poland had been perfect, but because, in comparison with life under the Soviet regime, it seemed like a beautiful, lost dream. And when, after their return, they began to see Soviet methods used in Poland, they did not wait for a dictatorship to materialize; the first signs were enough. Every institution and political party in Poland . . . was perverted to

serve the purpose of the new masters. . . . The people had only one way to vote against conditions—with their feet. The revived Jewish community began to melt away. It filtered out of the country, to displaced persons' camps in Germany, to Palestine, to a wandering, homeless existence—anything to escape. Now there are only sixty or seventy thousand left. . . . As a cultural and national entity, the small community is going through its death throes; *the Jewish Yishuv in Poland, once the most important segment of world Jewry, no longer exists*" (Italics supplied).

What stronger indication of the true Soviet attitude to Jewry could be wanted?

If more evidence is demanded, it can be found in the report to the convention of the Jewish Labor Committee referred to above. This report points out that "about 5,000,000 Jews lived before the war in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and the Balkan countries. This constituted thirty percent of the Jewish population of the world. In these countries the Jews have for centuries built their scholarship, religion and modern culture. Every city and town had Jewish schools, libraries and social and economic organizations. There also grew the mighty Jewish labor movement which led the movement for freedom and justice throughout the world. There also developed the mighty Jewish national movements which enriched Jewish life in all countries of the world." Hitler's seizure of these countries meant that the ferocious anti-Semitism of Nazism was introduced in

each and the bestial program to ex-assigned to him for permeation by

terminate Jews was put in effect. What happened in this period makes one of the most hideous chapters in the history of humankind.

With Hitler defeated, about a million Jews survived in the countries which the Soviet Union enslaved and saddled with stooges of Moscow. It was expected that the Jews would now fare better. But, says the report, "within a short period of time these Jews were turned over to those elements which years ago destroyed Jewish life in Russia." And at once there was instituted the same program which had been inflicted on the Jews in the Soviet Union.

"UNJUSTIFIED TOLERANCE IS OVER"

In Rumania, for example, the following steps were taken by the Communist government: (1) a drastic purge of Jewish communities and institutions to get rid of elements unacceptable to the Soviets; (2) the closing of all autonomous Jewish schools; (3) the seizure of all Jewish hospitals, orphanages, old people's homes, etc.; (4) the liquidation of organizations like the Federation of Rumanian Jews (which had existed for forty years). "The final upshot," says the report, "is that there are no more Jewish schools, Jewish cultural groups, Jewish communities, Jewish organizations. A small, powerful Communist group rules over the Jewish community in Rumania."

In the field of religion, the government designated a Dr. Rosen, notoriously a Communist, to be Chief Rabbi, and the whole of religious life was

Communism. The Communist paper *Unirea* said very bluntly that "the unjustified tolerance is over." Georgiu Des, vice premier in the Communist government, told parliament that "the Jews constitute a danger to the economic life of the country," and voiced similar strictures of an outspokenly anti-Semitic nature.

The very same story could be told of the other countries. In Hungary, for example, when under the Communist regime an election was held for officers of the Jewish community of Budapest, "one single united list of candidates was decreed by the Communists, with the result that complete control of the Jewish community was taken over by the Communists." Jewish schools and other institutions were nationalized. In Czechoslovakia the Jewish community was purged and suffered expropriation and restriction to bring it under tight Communist control. The Communist Minister of Information, Kopecky, denounced the Jews as "bearded Szlamas" and "Jewish good-for-nothings." The report repeats in substance what Mr. Goldstein has written of Poland, summing it up with "A thorough purge is going on in all phases of Jewish life in Poland." Of all the Russian-run countries the report remarks that "Communist regimes [are] smashing Jewish life, including their instruments of self-government and their very souls."

This is the pattern in the countries behind the iron curtain. It is everywhere the same for the Jews in the vast area which has fallen under the heel of Stalin. There can be no

doubting that the pattern is imposed by order of Moscow, and indeed it is but an application in newly acquired territory of the pattern already long in force in the Soviet Union.

While Jews in this country were gathering and sifting such data as those included in the Jewish Labor Committee report, the Soviets were playing a political trick which might possibly allay increasing Jewish criticism. This trick had to do with Zionism and the new state of Israel. Not all Jews are Zionists, but there can hardly be a Jew, no matter how much a non-Zionist, not in some measure affected by the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland.

ZIONISM PUNISHED AS TREASON

For thirty years the Soviets had been caustic enemies of Zionism. Propaganda and activity in its behalf were absolutely prohibited in the Soviet Union. Zionism was there punished as treason. The same policy was followed in the countries which, after the war, the Soviets took over. And an anti-Zionist line was trumpeted by Communist parties the world around. The New York *Daily Worker* constantly hammered at Zionism, saying, for example, in its issue of April 28, 1946, "The hopeless phantom of a Jewish state must be abandoned." But when the state of Israel was about to come into existence, the Soviets suddenly changed their tune. The shift can best be seen in the columns of the *Daily Worker* which, six months after regularly storming at the notion of a Jewish state, was loudly acclaiming the accomplished

fact and more than hinting that the Soviet Union was responsible for it. The strategy behind this move seems to have been that, with Britain out, the Soviets hoped for some kind of link between them and Israel so that Soviet interests in that section of the world might be better served. Hence the theme sounded by the *Daily Worker*, "Only those who fight for peace and American-Soviet friendship can be trusted to defend the Jewish State. The red-baiters will sell it out at the first opportunity."

SOVIET OPPORTUNISM

The Soviets have always banked and capitalized on the short memories which seem to be general in the world. Doubtless in this case they counted on Jews' forgetting the inveterate and active Soviet opposition to the establishment of a Jewish state. So successful has been their propaganda in whitewashing their record in other matters that many regarded this maneuver with apprehension. But just as precipitately as the Communists jumped to a pro-Zionist line, they abandoned it and took up a militant anti-Zionist position once again. The lead was given from Moscow by the ineffable Ilya Ehrenburg, journalistic tool of the dictatorship. It has been heeded by the New York *Morning Freiheit*, the Communist Yiddish newspaper. The *Freiheit* has hastened to cast away its temporary Zionist coloration and is now spewing venom at the "alleged cosmopolitan Jewish nation" which it sees (through glasses prescribed by Moscow) as "a bastion of Jewish reaction

and as a prop for Anglo-American imperialism."

So, after all, the Soviet trick was exposed by its perpetrators as no more than a trick, an example of the stark opportunism which rules Soviet pronouncements and policy. No Jew could now be under any illusion as to the crass cynicism of the Soviet stand on Israel.

Hard upon these revelations have come others calculated to shatter any last trace of credence in an enlightened and disinterested attitude toward the Jews on the part of the Soviets. It is now manifest that virulent anti-Semitism has been stirred up by the rulers of the Soviet Union.

This anti-Semitism was officially practised before it was officially voiced. When Igor Gouzenko, clerk in the Soviet embassy at Ottawa, broke away from his masters and exposed the Soviet spy rings in Canada, he said that since 1939 the Soviets had been imposing limitations on the admission of Jews to higher schools and universities. His assertion was scoffed at, but information from other sources has verified it.

While the Hitler-Stalin agreement was in force (1939-1941), the Soviets put restrictions and visited humiliations on Jews in order to please the Nazis. Stalin gave a banquet for Von Ribbentrop when the latter came to Moscow for the signing of the pact, and Soviet Minister Kaganovich was barred from the festive occasion because he was a Jew and Von Ribbentrop did not like Jews. The story of Vasili Kotov, a young Soviet officer who escaped to the Western world at

the close of the war, is told in W. L. White's *Land of Milk and Honey*. In it is Kotov's account of a meeting of Nazi and Soviet officers at a Polish country house while the pact obtained. "About fifteen minutes before the Germans were due, a Political Commissar hastily entered, and walked through the throng of Soviet officers, looking carefully at their faces. Then he called into a corner several lesser commissars, whispering instructions. These commissars then quietly went over to a dozen men who, because of their very black hair or high noses, could be recognized as Jews, whispering to them they would not eat with the main party, but at a separate party in another room."

Writing in the *New York Times* on April 8, 1949, Harry Schwartz said:

Non-Russians recently returned from the Soviet Union tell of widespread reports from travellers through Siberia of steady progress during 1948 in removing Jews from leading Soviet official and economic positions. Some Soviet citizens have told foreigners in Moscow that this campaign has made Soviet Jews the "most bitter group" in the Soviet Union today. . . . As early as 1947, diplomatic sources report, the late Solomon Mikhoels, then chairman of the recently dissolved Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, protested to Foreign Minister Molotov that Jews were being systematically excluded from staff positions in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, from positions as chairmen of Communist party and Government committees, and from atomic research posts.

It also became known that the only

Jewish publishing house and the only Yiddish daily in the U.S.S.R. were suppressed.

VICIOUS ATTACKS ON JEWS

Those who had heard rumblings of such doings were not taken by surprise when the anti-Semitic policy began to be screamed in the Soviet press. This screaming was, as Edward Weintal, *Newsweek* correspondent, put it, of unparalleled "bitterness, viciousness, and spite." The defamatory barrage was obviously aimed primarily at driving Jewish intellectuals from the cultural life of the Soviet Union. They were taxed with "exalting the Hebrew religion" and pelted with sneers styling them "homeless cosmopolitans," "passportless wanderers," "double dealers," "men with the dark souls of traitors." Jewish writers are now assailed in violent articles, and their Jewishness is specifically indicated by the printing of their original names in parentheses following their Russian names. Papers and magazines have broken out in a rash of savage cartoons pillorying Jews, the cruel caricatures being accompanied by the captions calling Jews "the passportless vagabonds of the human race." In text and drawings all manner of evil is attributed to the Jews as Jews. This, of course, is the very essence of anti-Semitism.

It is perhaps worth mentioning in passing that a leader of the current Soviet attack on Jews as Jews is Konstantin Simonov. Simonov, considered a great writer in the U.S.S.R., is no more than an irresponsible mega-

phone for whatever sentiments Stalin wants noised to the people. In this country a play and a novel by him were, just a few years back, almost rapturously acclaimed. This happened during that period when we were being plied with narcotics concocted to close our eyes to the true character of the Soviet regime. The American publishers and producers of Simonov's sub-mediocre scribblings, as well as the critics who praised them and the public who supported them, ought to ponder the smear-job now being done on the Jews by this same Simonov. "Impudent pygmies," he calls them, and "cosmopolitan scum," "gangsters," "castrated decadents," "Men without kith or kin," "Men utterly alien to the great Russia people."

The last phrase, according to some observers, gives the clue to the cam-

paign of anti-Semitism now being pushed through the U.S.S.R. Stalin, they say, is bent on whipping up a blazing nationalistic spirit, a fierce Russian patriotism, in order to divert the people's attention from the failure of socialism and the absence of those benefits which the Soviets have for three decades been promising and promising and have never yet delivered.

But the reason for the campaign is immaterial. The point is that anti-Semitism reminiscent of Hitler's brand is being promoted by the Soviets. This fact explodes, once for all, any notion that the Soviet Union is opposed on principle to anti-Semitism in any form. The Soviets, it must always be remembered, have no principles except to retain and expand their power. To do this, they scruple at nothing.

This Social Justice

"Social justice suffers from a twofold deficiency. It is not known well enough, and, paradoxically, it is too well known. By being too well known, I mean that social justice is used too much like a tag, a slogan, a catchword. It is a sonorous phrase that will fit readily into any sort of oratory. One need but to seek for a definition of social justice to discover how thoughtlessly the concept is bandied about. Catchwords and slogans have a way of becoming emasculated. Note what has happened to the word, 'democracy.' Social justice is too important a concept to be tampered with in this way."—*Rev. John F. Tocik, O.S.F.S., in CATHOLIC ACTION, Washington, D. C., May, 1949.*

Latin America

REV. JOHN J. CONSIDINE, M.M.

*Reprinted from THE SHIELD**

WHAT is this Latin America in which you and I are so keenly interested?

We have been reminded a hundred times that it is no homogeneous unit which fits neatly into any single pigeonhole. It is, like every other major region over the earth, a world of the weak and a world of the strong, a world of backward peoples and a world of keen, alert, forward-looking progressive peoples. It is a complex world and we shall blunder badly if we try to conceive it in any other fashion.

The world of the strong in the countries to the south of us is a world that possesses cultural and spiritual breadth and depth second to none among all the peoples of our planet. Let no North American be so foolish as to assume an attitude of superiority toward the Latin American of this world of the strong so far as concerns his possession of the gifts of life.

But let us glimpse at the world of the weak, a world that, out of Latin America's 140,000,000, numbers possibly 90,000,000 men and women who live deployed throughout a limitless countryside, in jungles, in the side streets of many, many cities.

Recently I had occasion to journey some 600 miles by launch on the Beni River in the Bolivian lowlands within the Amazon watershed. Our second day out, the Maryknoller in charge

spotted a little settlement on the bank and pulled in to the shore.

"Any chickens?" yelled the cook.

"No," came the answer from the river bank.

"Any eggs?"

"No."

"Any melons or other vegetables?"

"No."

"Anything at all to sell?"

"Not a thing," came the answer and our boat moved away.

"They seemed rather unfriendly," I remarked.

"No," said one of my companions, "they really meant it. It happens that some of these settlements not only have nothing to sell but sometimes suffer seriously from food shortage."

One of our mistaken notions about tropic soil in general is that it is immensely rich. Actually the nourishment has been leached out of much of it by heavy rains, and great quantities of fertilizer would be necessary to renew it. Then there are other huge problems, such as many weeds and many pests. In short, agriculture in the 4,000,000 square miles of the Amazon Valley is in most places very difficult. Sustenance farming of a poor variety is carried on, but large-scale production has never yet succeeded. No wonder that the watery Valley of the Amazon is an enormous desert land so far as population is concerned, with an average of one

* Shattuc Ave., Cincinnati 26, Ohio, April, 1949

human being to every two square miles.

On another occasion recently I found myself sitting with a young man twenty years of age in a little house in Masusani in the high Andes of southern Peru. I had come over the road some 200 miles from Puno, the provincial city on Lake Titicaca, which at 12,500 feet is the highest large body of water in the world. We had driven over passes that rose to 16,000 feet in a wild plateau country of alpacas and llamas and vicunas, an Indian country in which very few non-Indians live.

Now this timid boy in this miserable hut of adobe and thatch surprised me by saying: "I think I would like to study, Padre. I think I might go to school and perhaps become a dentist."

Simple enough words if uttered in many another region of Latin America but in the Indian areas of the Andes they were extraordinary. For these Indians usually do not study; they are Indians. The Aymara and the Quechua are the descendants of the Inca peoples of the past. Among the Aymara today there is not even one full-blooded Catholic priest. Millions of mountain Indians still possess a world of their own that follows the length of the mighty Andes chain into the Rocky Mountain chain of North America, from Chile to the northern borders of Mexico. The European and the Indian have melded in the Andean and Middle American republics and we have today the vigorous citizen of the New World that is neither European nor Indian

but a distinct entity in its own right. Nevertheless, a great Indian world remains, for the most part inarticulate, and in surveying Latin America it is never to be ignored.

HAITI

And now let us jump northward to the city of Aux Cayes in the Republic of Haiti. Haiti is, in a sense, the center of the Negro population of 20,000,000 that dwells within Latin America from the Caribbean to southern Brazil. Since the great majority of Latin-American Negroes are at least nominally Catholic, they represent the largest group of Negro Catholics in the world. In Aux Cayes I went with the Bishop, the Most Rev. Louis Collignon, O.M.I., who is from Lowell, Mass., to the poorest section of the city, called the savannah, a jumble of mud-and-grass shacks with no provision for light or water or sewage disposal. Here was elementary basic poverty. On one corner a woman sold potatoes, which she had separated into groups of four; each four went for four cents. The Bishop, evidently very much loved by the jovial folk, was wildly applauded when he bought four potatoes for each family in the neighborhood.

Ninety-five per cent of the Haitians live very near to this economic level. Those who make up the five per cent that constitute the leading class are making a great effort to improve their country's condition. I recall with what pride the President of the Haitian Red Cross told me of the local program for social action. Haiti's leaders are fiercely desirous

that their country be respected in the world for its efforts to better itself.

Latin America's world of the weak is not limited to the countryside. I recall the sights in the poor districts of its great cities—Santiago, Lima, Bogota, Mexico City, Caracas, and others. I recall the unadorned bitterness of Evangelisto Gonzales, who lives on Observatory Hill in the poorest section of Caracas.

"Are you able to make a living here, Gonzales?" I asked, as I sat in his shack with him and his mother. "Padre, Venezuela is a country where the rich live well and the poor live very poorly. I am a Venezuelan but I am not proud of my country. People ask us why we are Communists in this quarter. The answer is simple: because we are angry with the men who keep us poor. We like the people who try to help us. But some day we shall destroy the men who make us suffer."

Gonzales has lots of company in Latin America, lots more than he and his companions realize. It will take only the spark of leadership which communism is giving to the poor, the desperate, the harassed, the bitter, the world over to make him and his companions strong. There is only one conclusive answer to the Communists and that is to take from under their feet the arguments on which they stand, to change the social philosophy that breeds complacency in the face of poverty and disease and ignorance. Latin America has its share of this complacency along with the rest of the world.

"The naked truth is," stated Luis

Quintanilla, a Mexican diplomat, in 1943, "that no fewer than 85,000,000 Latin Americans are actually starving. They have no houses, no beds, no shoes." That statement is an oversimplification of the situation but it high-lights by exaggeration a condition of life which certainly exists in the Latin-American world.

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION

As a first initiative, Catholic students in the United States should cooperate with every Latin-American movement which seeks to accomplish good in accordance with the ideals of Christian social action. This means cooperation in the fields of the arts, culture, education, the sciences, sociology, government, religion.

It means, to my mind, working for the accomplishment of good rather than merely *against* unsound ideologies. It would be regrettable, it seems to me, to engage in a simple anti-communist movement. Catholics possess far too much potentially in the way of a positive, aggressive world social program to waste precious energies on a wholly negative plan of merely talking against communism. Let us fight communism by building a powerfully strong and superbly admirable Christian society.

As a second initiative, Catholic students in the United States should consider the great possibilities for the accomplishment of good by taking jobs in Latin America through which they may exert influence in favor of Catholic ideals. Thousands of American citizens are engaged every year by government and non-

government agencies and up to now relatively few of these have been Catholics.

It is extraordinary what happy consequences have already come from the exemplary lives of the few North American Catholics who have taken positions in Latin America. One Catholic military attaché is the talk of one of the southern capitals because of his regularity in attendance at Mass and of his frank espousal of all that is fine. A woman connected with a cultural bureau in another capital is welcomed by every women's group in the city because she so patently represents Catholic ideals.

As a third initiative, Catholic students in the United States should cooperate in very substantial fashion with the citizens of the countries south of the Rio Grande who come to the United States for whatever purpose, whether as students, as business men, or in other capacities. The possibilities in this field are enormous.

On an airplane in Bolivia, I met a young man who had been induced by some fellow students to join the Catholic Club at the University of Michigan. "You have no idea, Father," he explained to me, "how fine it made me feel to discover that I could be in the thick of everything in university life and have these wonderful Catholic connections."

Our finest contribution to Latin America would be to go there ourselves. In many areas lay helpers are needed as teachers, as medical and social workers. For the most part, however, full-fledged missionaries are required. It does no man any harm to say to himself, "I am rich—I have a life to give," and to ask himself quite directly if he would like to give this life of his for his fellows in Latin America. With the giving of one's life as a point of comparison, the giving of a few hours or even of a few days each year to forwarding Catholic interests in Latin America will appear a small matter.

War on Education

"One of the first targets of the totalitarians is religious education. They are convinced—and with good reason—that the more they can curtail religious education the greater is the possibility of their suppressing the Church, the chief obstacle in their road to domination. No religious education is possible in Russia, in the Balkans or along the Baltic. It is being suppressed in Czechoslovakia and Poland. In the Eastern Sector of Berlin the agreement on religious education is being sabotaged by impossible requirements, another example of how utterly worthless is the word of the Kremlin."—THE CATHOLIC NEWS, *New York*, August 6, 1949.

Christian Democracy

A. PICCIONI

Reprinted from PEOPLE & FREEDOM*

CHRISTIAN Democracy is neither a compromise nor a half-way house between the twin errors of Collectivism and Individualism. It has an original outlook on life and the world which exists of its own right, and a definite philosophy on which is based all its political and social theory, and from which spring its political and economic solutions.

A modern democracy must be founded on clear and explicit postulates. Juridical and political equality must be assumed; universal suffrage must be accepted as inevitable; political life must be envisaged as a conception in which rights are balanced by duties; it must be recognized that in the last resort sovereignty rests with the People.

Freedom must be safeguarded. A parliamentary form of government is desirable, a development of what today we call democracy, but animated by the moral element which Christianity bestows. Since Democracy can only be realized and perfected through the application of Christian principles, Christian Democrats must permeate their thinking with ethical and religious values.

The character of a Christian Democratic community will be distinctive. In it, respect for human personality will be complete, and that personal

This is an abbreviated text of an address delivered to a Congress of Christian Democratic Youth groups at Fiuggi, Italy, in July, 1948. It was first printed by the secretariat of the Nouvelles Equipes Internationales, the international organization of Christian Democratic parties.

ity will be given full scope to express itself—in the exercise of rights and the performance of duties. In its acknowledgement of this basic principle Christian Democracy may claim to have the most hopeful method of ensuring the peaceful development of civil society.

We must not overlook the fact that democracy must be built upon foundations which are more fundamental than itself, namely, the family and the Church. This concept—to which the name pluralism has been attached—is a necessary corollary of the previous one. Equally so is the notion that democracy finds its most human, and its most effective, expression in an organic view of society, which sees the life of the community as the sum of the activities of the smaller units exercising their separate functions, and manifesting their common will

* 32, Chestow Villas, London W. 11, April, 1949

through a kind of hierarchy, beginning with the family and proceeding through the trade union, local community and State Assembly to the international federation.

Social Justice must also be done. The bettering of the condition of the working classes is a job that cannot be postponed. It will be essential, moreover, to take effective action to secure a more equitable distribution of property. The dispossessed are in no position to exercise responsibility.

ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Since politics today are inextricably linked with economics, we must therefore examine the economic implications of the principles which we have enunciated. It seems clear that we cannot avoid some form of "planned economy." Rejecting economic liberalism on the one hand and collectivism on the other, we must take and apply what is good in both theories. We will have neither "laissez-faire" or unbridled capitalism with their unqualified repudiation of State intervention: nor will we accept the exclusive theory of State capitalism which visualizes all economic activity as the prerogative

of the State. Christian social teaching commends State mediation in economic affairs as one of the normal means by which economic life is preserved and kept compatible with social justice. It will be our duty to confine such interference within the limits dictated by our principles.

As regards international relations we must remember that our primary object is peace. In order to achieve peace and understanding between peoples, Christian Democrats are prepared to recognize any form of international democratic association, so long as it really reflects the opinions of the peoples it represents. An association which is not genuinely democratic would not be desirable, and it is doubtful if it would accomplish the desired end.

As a preliminary step, we will welcome any kind of co-operation, contact and mutual exchange of ideas between Democratic parties whose inspiration is Christian. Let this meeting mark the first mile-stone on the road to such unanimity in theory and in practice among all who agree on Christian Democratic theory as will achieve the highest degree of co-operation among all peoples.



Family Wage

"The family wage is *due in justice* to all adult men; for in normal society every man has not only the right to marry, but often in view of his personal needs (Cf. I Cor. 7, 9) a duty to marry. And the main reason why many do not marry is the absolute lack of means before and after marriage. Every man, therefore, ought to receive a family wage."—A. V. Ellis, S.J., in C.S.G. BULLETIN, Oxford, England, July, 1949.

State Intervention

JOHN B. COLLINS

Editor, *The Pittsburgh Catholic*

*Reprinted from the PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC**

FORMER Secretary of State James F. Byrnes is the latest exponent of the argument that measures for control by the government of economic conditions may be leading us "down the road to statism." But neither he, nor any of the others who raise this cry, is definite in explaining the alternative they favor. Do they want all regulations removed, so that economic life becomes a jungle of exploitation of the weak by the strong, an unrestrained application of "competition," "free enterprise," "supply and demand"?

Of course they don't; they want laws to protect and favor certain sections of the population; but any attempt to enact laws to guard the rights of all, to extend the benefits of our civilization to all individuals, to make the general welfare—the promotion of which is the first duty of any just government—really "general;" that, it seems, would be statism.

And to avoid statism, they claim, a certain percentage must be condemned to a low standard of living, to inadequate food, shelter, clothing, medical care, and so on. Certainly those who suffer from none of these disabilities should not pose as "defenders of freedom" when they de-

nounce efforts to better the lot of Americans enduring economic injustice.

To be sure, the control by the state of the economic life of the nation is a dangerous, undesirable thing, but why does not Mr. Byrnes, and others who are alarmed about it, fight with all their power for the right alternative—the extension by private enterprise of its benefits to all the people? The real estate lobby, for instance, has patriotic shudders at the entry of the government into the field of housing, saying that it menaces our free institutions. Why didn't the real estate men show energy and ability enough to solve the need without government interference? They failed and are still failing, and the families now lacking decent homes would be multiplied a thousandfold if it were not for government action.

As far as food is concerned, government "interference" has accomplished a plentiful supply; that it is not available to all the people, at reasonable cost, is due to refusal to accept further and reasonable regulation. They tell us it would be "statism" if the farmers got a good price for their products and the public got lower prices when crops were heavy: we are supposed to believe

* 404 Magee Bldg., Pittsburgh 22, Pa., June 23, 1949

that it is more "constitutional" or something for potatoes to rot on the ground, as they did last year, or for milk to be thrown away, as is now happening in Pennsylvania, than for the government to enter any deeper into farm regulation. If they don't want government interference, the producers should themselves strive earnestly to solve the problem of fair distribution.

The medical profession, through its formal association, is shrieking bitter shrieks at the proposal for government health insurance. The proposal raises, indeed, complex and formidable problems; but where have the leaders of the medical association been all these years, that the scandal of inadequate, over-costly medical care now takes them by surprise? Why do they, even now, show so much concern about the difficulties that would be imposed upon them by the government plan, and so little concern about the conditions the plan proposes to correct? All the statements issued in opposition to govern-

ment health insurance simply take it for granted that "some" of the American people will have to get along without proper medical care, and that those who can afford to pay well will continue to be given preferred and unlimited attention. This may be good business, and it may indicate a firm resistance to the encroachments of "statism," but it isn't human and it isn't moral.

And that, of course, is the point that Mr. Byrnes and the others overlook, in their denunciations of "statism." The entry of the government into the fields of economics and welfare is just a reaction to the abandonment of moral standards on the part of the persons engaged in those fields. Greed and injustice have made "private enterprise" a shambles, and the government, in fulfillment of its obligations to its people, must make an effort, clumsy and risky though it be, to restore order and justice. If we want to get government out, we'll have to get morality back in.



Menace of Lysenkoism

"Our ground-rules of tolerant give and take are not understood by those who explicitly deny any tolerance, who cynically accept naked and irresponsible force as the ultimate arbiter. To extend the usual human-canine amenities to a dog suffering from hydrophobia is obviously to invite disaster. To pretend that this fulminating madness can be placated is stupid. If the new doctrine according to Marx prospers, we will find it very difficult to arrange a divided peace with it."—Robert C. Cook in *JOURNAL OF HEREDITY*, July, 1949.

Editorials

Unfettered Profit

A NEW kind of fad has grown up lately in our newspapers. They present a full page ad in the form of an encomium on the values considered important in the founding of our country and now vital to its maintenance. There is usually a banner headline in which the word America figures prominently, and factories and farmers and steel mills rise in rugged strength across the middle of the page. The next significant portion of the ad consists of the "argument," which may be a tribute to free enterprise, rugged individualism, Yankee ingenuity, American know-how, or any of a dozen more of the semi-mythical qualities of our citizenry. The last line of the page is in some ways the most significant of all; it is almost without fail the name of one of the great industrial companies or business enterprises of our land.

One of these large and expensive advertisements appeared this week in some of our papers expressing the view that there was something going on in the country that was not being recorded in the papers, and which was described as a "steady, insidious chipping away at what we know as Freedom." It turns out that the best name suggested for this value in our lives, that has now become so dangerously threatened, is "the Hope for Re-

ward." This elusive quality it seems is "back of every great and good thing this nation and its people enjoy," and is as well by a curious bit of physiology at once the "life-blood" and the "backbone" of the country. There is apparently some sinister group at work in our nation whose design is to wreck our hard-won national solidarity and we may well all be concerned about the matter.

At this point the reader has become sufficiently excited to force himself to read on and to discover how his world is being attacked. It suddenly develops that the reward of which we have been speaking is "profits" and the national saboteurs are those who strive to "control and regulate the profits of business." The further fact develops that only "as long as that Hope of Reward remains unlimited—unfettered, this country will remain free." One final thought is left with the reader besides—the freedom of the individual is so intimately tied up with the freedom of business that if the latter is lost, at once is our individual liberty doomed.

If all this matter were only a single isolated case, it would be senseless to comment on it, but it has become something of an epidemic and shows no sign of being on the wane. It is a great pity indeed that the men who make up these ads don't read the rest of the newspaper. The philosophy of economic liberalism that is presented

in honeyed words by these ads has been condemned by name by the Pontiffs for the last fifty years and most recently by non-Catholic Christians at Amsterdam. The theory of the right to *unlimited* profits is not in any sense at all responsible for the greatness of our land or of any other. Quite the contrary, it is this spirit of *laissez faire, laissez passer* that has discredited capitalism before the world and opened the door to some very sad substitutes.

Fortunately, as we have had occasion to point out before in these columns, thoughtful businessmen no longer share this unmoral and outmoded economic philosophy. The most important element in the consideration of business profits is the sense of *business responsibility* and it is this element and its propagation that will spell the future economic success of our country.—THE PILOT, Boston, Mass., June 11, 1949.

Transition in Hollywood

FOR THE first time in Hollywood history, studios are filming stories on the race question. Four companies already are completing work in such varied aspects of the interracial problem as the story of an attempted lynching (in MGM's *Intruder in the Dust*); a story of Negroes who "pass" for whites (in Film Classics' *Lost Boundaries*); an account of intermarriage (in Twentieth-Century Fox's *Pinky*), and a tale of a Negro soldier (in Screenplay's *Home of the Brave*).

Several important questions im-

mediately come to mind with respect to this newest Hollywood venture. Will movies with such themes be profitable to producers? Will they be acceptable to the public? Will they meet the entertainment requirements? What of the sincerity of the film makers?

Answers to the first two are partly found in the extraordinary success last season of two films on anti-Semitism: *Crossfire* and *Gentlemen's Agreement*, and in the extended New York run of a modest documentary about a Negro lad from Harlem, *The Quiet One*. A milder film on prejudice, RKO's *The Boy With Green Hair*, met with abundant financial success last season.

Will such films entertain? It took the foreign film makers, with pictures like *Paisan*, *The Open City*, and *To Live in Peace*, to prove to Hollywood that entertainment and drama of the most powerful sort can be made from contemporary social problems.

But the question which vitally affects the genuine presentation of the social theme concerns the sincerity of the film makers themselves. Philip Dunne, co-author of the script *Pinky*, answers it. Writing in the *New York Times* May 1, Mr. Dunne says:

They have seen the problem as one of presenting these materials, not as preachments, but as living dramatic stories . . . We neither deny nor condone the bitter fact of racial prejudice; we simply try to dramatize its effect on a girl (*Pinky*) who might be anyone's daughter, sister or sweetheart. We are propagandists only in so far as we insist that every human being is en-

titled to personal freedom and human dignity . . . we have championed no glib solution of the problem. We have tried to present it fairly and realistically. We hope that each member of the audience will be moved to seek a solution of his own. If he finds it in his heart, our venture will have been a success.

This healthy attitude on the part of the film makers has greatly accelerated public interest in these films, which five years ago would not have been contemplated. The transition clearly shows that the very real drama which they record today may soon come to be of importance only to the historian of tomorrow.—*INTERRACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y., May, 1949.*

Things That Are Not Caesar's

THE pastoral letter issued by Archbishop Josef Beran and his Bishops and read last Sunday in Czechoslovakia's Catholic churches brings down to date a story that comes close home to people of every faith and even to those who have no formal faith.

This is true, even though the communist rulers of Czechoslovakia, like those of other communist-dominated countries, are just now attacking a single Church. In Czechoslovakia they have censored or suppressed this Church's press; they have inventoried its religious properties with the obvious purpose of sequestering them; they have controlled or suppressed its schools; and in the words

of the pastoral letter, "On the whole it can be said that outside the church (buildings) any religious activity is impossible and many fear to visit churches lest they be accused of reaction and fear the loss of their means of existence." The answer of the Czechoslovak hierarchy is that they are loyal to the Republic, but that "they do not want the Church to become a mere servant of the state—in other words, the bearer of a different philosophy under a cloak of Christian religion."

It is clear that the threat in Czechoslovakia, as in every communist-ruled country, is to all churches and to all individuals who assert the right of private conscience. The spokesmen of communism have often been ambiguous in discussing this question. More than twenty years ago, for example, Mr. Stalin told a delegation of American labor leaders that Russian laws "guaranteed to citizens the right to adhere to any religion." He added, however, that "anti-religious propaganda is a means by which the complete liquidation of the reactionary clergy must be brought about." A "reactionary" clergy or a "reactionary" Church, from this point of view, is simply one which does not permit itself to be used as a political instrument of the state. In effect, the communist god is the Party and its leaders. The Communists may permit the worship of another and more ancient God if the communist god is always given precedence. But from the viewpoint of any sincerely held religion this is blasphemy.

The world's earlier tyrannies mostly struck at men's bodies and properties. The Russian Communists and Russian-inspired Communists, armed with the philosophy of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, are trying to do a more thorough job. They are trying to destroy men's souls—to corrupt them, to deprive them of free judgment, to violate and debase the human conscience.

An assault like this upon one Church or one person is an attack upon every church and every person. Everyone who respects the right of the private conscience or who has any concern for the dignity of man is here on the same side. We can do little, perhaps, to help those who are caught by the new tyranny behind frontiers that we cannot pass. What we can do is to express our indignation and our sympathy. Beyond that we are called upon to strengthen in our own country the ideas of tolerance, of respect for another's opinions and of unity in the democratic essentials. Because there is less freedom in the oppressed countries we must strive for more freedom here. We must realize that this is the crux of today's world-wide struggle.

In the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, in substantially the same words in the King James version and in the Douay Bible, the story is told of the attempt of the Pharisees to "entangle" the Founder of Christianity. They asked Him: "What thinkest Thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or not?" He answered: "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things

that are God's." No matter what one's religious belief, the words have a dramatic meaning. There are boundaries to the power of any Caesar whether he calls himself Hitler or Stalin or by some other name; whether he masquerades as a "people's democracy" or whether he nakedly admits the truth. There are things that are not Caesar's and that by no exercise of power can ever be made Caesar's. It is the great challenge of our time to all of us to assert those things, in whatever language we speak, in whatever churches we worship, in whatever groups we move. We must have faith that the attempted conquest of the human soul and spirit will fail in our generation as it has failed so many times before.—NEW YORK TIMES, New York, N. Y., June 28, 1949.

Catholic Daily Papers

THE need of the Church in America for a score of Catholic daily newspapers in strategic larger cities of the nation was set forth by Father Paul C. Bussard in a sermon at Notre Dame University's baccalaureate Mass last Sunday.

Father Bussard's position as editor of the notably successful monthly *Catholic Digest* and as president of the Catholic Press Association of the United States entitles him to speak as a qualified professional journalist and lends his suggestions a validity that those of an amateur enthusiast would not possess.

Our lack of Catholic dailies is not excused by our minority position in

America, Father Bussard pointed out. He cited China where, before the Communists took over, six Catholic dailies had been established by Archbishop Paul Yu-Pin. In Holland three million Catholics maintain five daily newspapers.

Here in America, he said, Communists, who are far fewer than our 25 millions, sustain more than 100 publications. Catholic weekly and monthly periodicals number about 400, with an estimated circulation of 14 million.

Father Bussard did not cite (as he might have) the *Christian Science Monitor*, an influential daily newspaper produced by a sect numbering only a few hundred thousand adherents.

Why have we no comparable vehicles of Catholic expression?

Father Bussard says the reason is that the "laity have been expecting a daily to be handed down to them by the bishops and have thought of it as something they would be given to support, rather than produce." He added:

They are under the wrong impression that a Catholic paper must be operated by priests or bishops since they are the ones who administer the Sacraments. It is a very wrong impression. We should have known better, at least since 1866. In that year the second plenary council of Baltimore in one of its published decrees said with complete clarity that the bishops want to exercise

only a negative control over a publication. The laymen are to be left completely free as long as they publish nothing contrary to faith or morals.

Father Bussard's call for Catholic dailies implies no criticism of our Catholic press as now constituted. If anything, it is an implied compliment. It implies this:

That the good fruits our Catholic press has produced to date would be multiplied and intensified by publications appearing more frequently—more "on top of events."

There are other "practical" reasons why we haven't a score of Catholic dailies today, instead of the three or four now publishing (two in the Polish language, one in Lithuanian, we believe). A quarter-century ago Iowa's *Catholic Tribune* undertook daily publication. It languished and, in spite of great financial sacrifices by its publishers and editors, died after some twenty years—for lack of support.

That same blunt "practical" difficulty besets all our Catholic publications today. Few of us today can boast that we reach all the Catholics in the areas we seek to serve.

It isn't that we aren't trying and won't continue trying. But we won't get where we are trying to get until a great many more good Catholics pitch in and try with us.—THE MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, Detroit, Mich., June 9, 1949.

Federal Aid in Education

THE REV. WILLIAM E. McMANUS
Assistant Director, NCWC Department of Education

*Statement before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor,
June 3, 1949.*

INTRODUCTION

THE department of education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, is grateful for the opportunity to express its views on the topic, Federal Aid to Education, as proposed in several bills now pending before the committee.

The department of education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, is an agency established by the Catholic bishops of the United States to coordinate the activities of Catholic schools. There are in the United States 10,183 Catholic elementary and secondary

schools staffed by 86,945 teachers and enrolling 2,607,879 pupils. My testimony is divided into four parts:

1. Basic principles which should govern the relationship of American government to our nation's schools.

2. Basic policies on the relationship of the Federal Government to our nation's schools.

3. Practical application of these principles and policies to the Federal aid bills before the subcommittee.

4. Summarized statement of my position on Federal aid to education.

A. BASIC PRINCIPLES

Principle I. Parents have the primary and principal right in the education of their children. This right carries with it the corresponding duty to arrange for the formal education of their children in a school which will prepare the child for the responsibilities of adulthood and of citizenship. In exercising this right and in performing this duty parents may select either a public or nonpublic school for the education of their children.

This principle, once challenged by the people of Oregon, has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the celebrated Oregon School case:

The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union re-

pose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instructions from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.

Principle II. In our democracy the establishment, maintenance and the general control of schools are responsibilities of the people in a community. The people fulfill these responsibilities generally in three ways:

1. Through a school board which controls a public school.

2. Through a church which controls a parochial school.

3. Through an association which controls a private school.

It has been characteristic of American education that various schools in a community have worked together in a common effort to train good citizens for the community and the nation. In the typical American community there is little evidence of any conflict either between the children of public and non-public schools or between their parents.

Principle III. Unlike a totalitarian state, the government in a democracy has of itself nothing to teach. It does not attempt to impose itself upon the citizens.

In a democracy the functions of the government in education are restricted to:

1. Financing schools which meet standards set in terms of preparation of citizenship.

2. Enforcing compulsory education laws.

3. Engaging in direct educational activities in such fields as military science and government service.

Principle IV. Education is not to be regarded as a governmental service similar to police or fire protection. The instinct of democracy within us, or if you will, the vision of our Founding Fathers, has given us a system of edu-

cation which is administered by a separate mechanism apart from other phases of political organization. This unique American practice is a recognition of the fact that education does not belong to the Government in the same way as do other activities that need public support and control; its purposes and processes are to be determined not by governmental dictation and political power, but by the people, particularly parents, whose interests the schools are intended to serve.

Principle V. The financing of schools through public taxation is a responsibility of government, especially of local and State governments. This responsibility entails an obligation to observe the norms of distributive justice in disbursing tax funds among the schools within the community. Because government itself has nothing to teach and because it receives a full return from its financial investment in education when a school produces well-trained citizens, therefore, every school to which parents may send their children in compliance with the compulsory education laws of the State is entitled to a fair share of tax funds. Local and State governments which refuse to support schools not under the control of the local school board are guilty of an injustice against other qualified schools within the community.

B. BASIC POLICIES ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS

This relationship is one of obligation and restriction, i.e., certain duties which the Federal Government should perform in connection with education and other activities from which it

should refrain. First, let us consider its obligations.

1. By authority of the general welfare clause of the Constitution, the Federal Government has an obligation to

secure for every American child, regardless of his place of residence, an opportunity for an adequate education. This education should include the following essential services:

a. A well-planned program of general education for all children and youth and also suitable preparation for particular vocations in accordance with the needs of the children and youth.

b. Instruction by carefully selected teachers who are competent and well prepared, and who are interested in the development of community life.

c. Safe and sanitary school buildings adapted to a modern program of instruction and related services.

d. Suitable school equipment and instructional materials, including books and other reading materials adequate for the needs of the children.

e. Student aid when necessary to permit able young people to remain in school at least up to age 18.

f. Suitable opportunities for part-time and adult education.¹

EQUALIZE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

2. In the interest of national unity the Federal Government has an obligation more nearly to equalize educational opportunity among the States. Sectional antagonisms, racial discrimination and other forms of civic tension are largely the product of an educational system which tolerates grossly unequal educational opportunities among various parts of the United States. Children who are deprived of educational advantages granted to their neighbors a few hundred miles away or, in the case of Negroes, to their white neighbors in the school next door, will not easily comprehend the meaning of the Ameri-

can slogan "E Pluribus Unum." In a nation as large, powerful and wealthy as ours, there is no excuse for letting the kind of an education which a child receives depend on the mere circumstances of his place of residence or the color of his skin. If we are to have a nation which is truly one in fact as well as in sentiment, then we must expect our Federal Government to promote national unity by means of more nearly equalizing education opportunities throughout the United States.

3. In the interest of national defense the Federal Government has an obligation to eliminate illiteracy so that all able-bodied persons of sound mind and character may be called upon for military duty in a national emergency.

4. Under the general welfare clause, the Federal Government may stimulate specialized research, conduct surveys and otherwise promote the best interests of American education.

Secondly, let us consider the activities from which the Federal Government should refrain:

1. The Federal Government should not establish, operate or manage any school system of general education, nor should it engage directly in any other educational activities except such as are necessary to train Government personnel.

2. No branch or bureau of the Federal Government should be allowed to direct, supervise or control the curriculum or personnel of any school assisted with Federal funds.

3. No Federal law pertaining to education should require any State to change or to modify its Constitution or laws as a condition for receiving Federal funds.

¹ Report of the committee, the Advisory Committee on Education, 1938, p. 17.

C. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS OF THESE PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES TO THE FEDERAL AID BILLS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE

From my study of the Federal aid question and from my impressions of the public hearings thus far, I would conclude that a majority of the witnesses and most members of the Subcommittee would endorse a number of principles and policies stated in this brief. For example, there would be, I presume, unanimous agreement on such propositions as:

1. Parents have a Constitutional right to send their children to either a public or nonpublic school.
2. The schooling of children is mainly a local or community responsibility.
3. The Federal Government should not control the curriculum or personnel of Federally-aided schools.

Likewise, most persons probably would admit at least these two basic facts:

1. Millions of American children through no fault of their own are being denied adequate educational opportunities.
2. Gross inequalities of educational opportunity prevail between the States.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

One therefore might reasonably expect that proposed legislation for Federal aid to education would be based on these principles and policies. This is not the case. The two Federal aid bills, S.246 and H.R.4643, assigned a priority of attention by this Subcommittee either disregard or violate the very premises for Federal assistance to the nation's school children.

The bills are supposed to equalize

educational opportunity; actually, they would produce greater inequalities of opportunity. The measures presumably would benefit all American school children; actually, the proposed bills prohibit any form of assistance to nonpublic school pupils and at least tolerate the denial of this help to educationally under-privileged children of minority groups. S.246 and H.R.4643 are said to prohibit Federal interference with the state administration of education; actually, both measures virtually prohibit a State from using any Federal funds to aid nonpublic school pupils even though a State may wish to use the funds for this purpose. The two measures explicitly prohibit any Federal official to interfere with the curriculum or the teachers of any school assisted with Federal funds; but the very same bills allow State education officials full discretionary power, even to the extent of controlling curricula and teachers in local or county schools assisted with Federal money.

To be specific, may I refer directly to several sections of the Senate Bill, S.246 which, in my opinion, either disregard or violate the very principles and policies which justify Federal activity in education.

I note that the preamble of S.246 makes no reference to the educational prerogatives of parents. Omission of this reference cannot be lightly dismissed as a mere failure to state the obvious. We must remember that throughout the world citizens of other nations are closely watching the progress of this legislation. After long experience with centralized and bureau-

cratic control of education, these people are waiting to see whether we in the United States will safeguard our future generations against even the remote danger of educational dictatorship by incorporating into our first basic law for Federal aid an unmistakably clear statement about the rights of parents to control their children's education. Europeans know that totalitarian governments, determined to suppress all parental control of education, repeatedly have captured complete control of a nation's schools on the pretense of equalizing educational opportunity.

Although our European neighbors have the greatest confidence in the integrity of our present purpose, they would, I am sure, advise us to be cautious—at least cautious enough to declare in our first general education law that parents have the primary right in education and that no branch of government may by direction or indirection interfere with the reasonable exercise of this right.

Perhaps the best precedent for this recommendation is the English *reorganization of education law* which, like the present measures for Federal aid, aims to reduce inequalities of educational opportunity. As first proposed the English legislation was a grandiose description of how English education would look under a socialist government. As amended through the influence of persons and organizations which cherished the fundamental freedoms of democratic government, the English law explicitly declared that parents had the right to manage the education of their children, to select either a public or denominational school for their education, and to receive tax support for both public and denominational schools.

The issue of parental rights is no

idle question. As things are in Europe today, respect for the educational rights of parents and tax support of private schools are two reliable indices of the democratic character of a government or a political party.

Take the latest example. At Bonn, where the new Constitution for western Germany was discussed, the Socialist Party vigorously opposed any explicit reference to parental rights and objected strenuously to the establishment of a school system which would permit parents to send their children to tax-supported denominational schools. To the Socialist way of thinking, government, preferably a centralized government, should manage all education and parents should accept whatever kind of education the government in power decides is best for their children.

DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

Opposed to this philosophy is the democratic ideal that government is the servant of the people, not their master, that in regard to education government exists to serve parents, not to dominate them. In the democratic way, government and parents cooperate in the task of preparing boys and girls for their responsibilities as adults and citizens. In the American way, diversity, not regimentation, unity, not uniformity, are educational ideals. Any law, therefore, which by direction or indirection might force nonpublic schools out of existence is a regrettable departure from the ideals of democratic education.

To clinch my point, may I say that after my experience in Europe this summer, where I studied educational developments for a 3-month period, I would venture the prediction that the enactment of S.246 in its present form would be hailed by the Socialist Party

as a triumphant victory for its cause. Socialists will rejoice at the United States' progress towards a centrally financed monolithic public school system. But our Founding Fathers and American citizens who understand what has happened to their educational system will not rejoice.

S.246 has been interpreted to the people of the United States as a measure designed primarily to give every child an opportunity for an adequate education and substantially to reduce present inequalities of educational opportunity among the States. That is an egregious misinterpretation. The correct interpretation is this. S.246 is a bill which will turn over about 250 million Federal dollars to State departments of education to be expended for any public school current expenditure at the discretion of State education officials. This is a fabulous arrangement. The State Department of Education in New York (a State which expends \$241.37 a year for every public school child) is scheduled to receive a handsome donation of \$11,925,000. Now let us ask some questions about the use of this money.

Must this money be used to improve educational opportunities in the poorer sections of the State? No. If the State authorities so decide, all the money may be given to New York City.

Must the money be distributed throughout the State in the same pattern as the State equalization fund? No. This is *Federal* money. It can be spent for anything—any place.

Must the money be used to raise classroom teachers' salaries? No. Administrators may, if they wish, raise their salaries and enrich their programs regardless of the demands for increases in teachers' salaries.

May State officials demand curricular

or personnel changes in a local school as a condition for receiving Federal funds? Yes. With eleven million dollars to disburse at their discretion, State education officials will be subjected to pressures of all sorts to which the Federal government should not expose them.

Even in the poorer States, the deplorable inequalities of educational opportunity actually may be increased by reason of the Federal grant. For example, Alabama is scheduled to receive \$17,390,000 under S.246. I understand that an investment of at most \$2 million will guarantee to every child the minimum requirement of \$55. That leaves Alabama education officials free to spend \$15 million as they see fit. Nothing in the law requires them to spend \$55.50 for any child. If they so decide, the whole \$15 million can be given to Mobile and Birmingham.

Under the formula in S.246, the maximum amount of funds which would be used to guarantee a minimum education and for guaranteed equalization comes to less than \$25 million. To my mind, it is inconceivable that the Federal Government would pass out the balance, \$250 million, without any definite understanding about the manner in which the funds will be used.

STATES HAVE POOR RECORD

Do I not trust the States? I do not. Most of the States have very poor records of effort or accomplishment in the field of equalization. Doctor Norton's charts depicted the wide range of expenditure per classroom units even in the wealthy States which have plenty of money with which to put their own houses in order. If Pennsylvania, for example, with its own laws or with its own money has failed to equalize educational opportunity, may the Federal

Government reasonably expect that Pennsylvania will use its Federal grant for equalization purposes exclusively? I think not. In any event, I don't think that the use of Federal funds for education should be a matter of guesswork by the Federal Government. Taxpayers have a right to expect a more careful consideration of their money.

The formula in S.246 allocates funds to the States on the basis of their total child populations, ages 5-17. All children in both public and nonpublic school are counted to determine the amount of Federal funds which each State shall receive. One would assume, therefore, that the funds appropriated for all children would be available for all children. This is not the case.

Under S.246 over \$17 million would be allocated to the States "on account of" nonpublic school children. Nonpublic school children would receive practically no benefit from the funds presumably appropriated for them. Actually, public school pupils would benefit at the expense of nonpublic school children.

A good example is New York. In this State, there are approximately 433,000 nonpublic school children. Under S.246 \$5 would be allocated to the State for each one of these pupils—a total allocation of \$2,168,155. All of this money would benefit public school children exclusively—except such few dollars as might be expended to furnish bus rides for all school pupils.

I submit that the restriction of all Federal aid to public school pupils is unjust, arbitrary and dangerous.

It is unjust because it denies to about 3,000,000 children benefits to which they have a right as full-fledged American citizens ruled by the Federal Government, which is obliged by its Constitution to promote the general welfare

of all American citizens. The graduates of nonpublic schools are eligible to vote, qualified for public office, and subject to call for military service. Why should they be denied the benefits of an education law designed to reduce illiteracy and better to prepare all American children for their civic responsibilities? Are they "second-class" citizens? Does their attendance at an accredited nonpublic school of their parents' choice disqualify them from opportunities granted to other children? I think not. If each and every boy and girl is expected to serve his or her country in time of war, then each and every young person has a right to expect his government to be absolutely fair and impartial in the distribution of its peace-time benefits. I would remind this committee that during the war draft boards did not regard attendance at a nonpublic school as cause to disqualify any person from military service.

CONGRESS SHOULD DECIDE

The restriction of Federal funds to public school pupils is arbitrary. Under the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court the Congress may appropriate funds to supply non-religious textbooks, bus rides and health aids to both public and nonpublic school children. Provision of these services can be accomplished without any violation of State Constitutions or laws. There is a precedent for such assistance in the National School Lunch Law, which guarantees school lunches to all children without any violation of State laws. Therefore, I maintain that Congress has full freedom to decide for itself whether nonpublic school children shall benefit from Federal aid. Full responsibility for this decision must rest with the Congress. Consequently, S.246

in its present form represents an arbitrary decision to extend special and exclusive privileges to public school children. "Arbitrary" is a strong word, but I can find no other that accurately describes S.246 in its present form.

Finally, this unjust and arbitrary restriction is dangerous. There is much more at stake here than a few million dollars. All parties to the controversy admit this fact. The amount of Federal aid to be granted or denied to nonpublic school pupils will neither make nor break them. Around this dispute over a few million dollars revolve serious controversies on the rights of parents, the status of private schools in a democracy and the relationship of government to education. I dare say that any person who wants to restrict parental rights, to jeopardize the security of private schools, and to concede to government an increasing amount of control over education will see in Section 6, S.246, a vindication of his point of view. For that reason I say that the bill is dangerous. In its present form it may establish a precedent which in the end may ruin our whole American school system.

All these objections apply in even greater degree to H.R.4643. Not only does this measure fail to guarantee the use of Federal funds for equalization purposes, it actually allows a State to substitute Federal funds for its own expenditures. Not only does the bill fail to guarantee any help to nonpublic school children, it also fails to guarantee even a tolerable degree of equity for children in separate schools for minority races.

There are two contradictions in H.R. 4643 to which I should like to call the Subcommittee's attention.

1. The bill presumably is designed to give the States full freedom in the

use of Federal funds. Actually the bill forbids any State to use one cent of Federal money for nonpublic schools or school children regardless of a State's practices or wishes to the contrary. For example, one of our great "State's rights" States is Vermont which, I assume, would like to use Federal money as it pleases. Under H.R.4643 it could not use Federal funds to pay tuition to private academies even though it uses its own funds for this purpose. Moreover, the bill, for some reason I do not understand, excludes bus rides and health aids from the definition of current expenditures despite the fact that every State in the nation lists these items among its current educational expenditures for auxiliary services.

2. The bill presumably is drafted to promote national unity and good will among all peoples. Actually Section 5 of this bill, authorizing judicial review of the expenditure of all Federal funds, will stir up a tempest of legal suits all over the United States. Community after community will be subjected to racial and religious tension as taxpayers quarrel in the courts about the use of Federal funds to give a parochial school child a textbook or some other form of service.

VEHICLES OF COMPROMISE

In summary, therefore, the two bills, S.246 and H.R.4643 contain so many violations of sound principles of justice, equity and good government that our nation would be better served by a rejection of the whole idea of Federal aid than by the subjection of our educational system to the provisions of these measures. It is better to have no Federal aid at all than to accept a bill which is based not on principles of justice and equity but on expediency and compromise. In legislation for

housing, social security and even medical care, we may risk bills which are largely the product of compromise and adjustment to political pressures. With legislation for education, we dare not take this risk. The law for education must be as nearly perfect as is humanly possible. The drafting of this kind of a law will demand statesmanship of high caliber. I am hopeful that the Subcommittee after a few months of study and consultation with experts may be able to draft that kind of law.

After listening to the Senate debate and these hearings, I have come to the conclusion that probably the most practical and the safest method of granting Federal aid to education is a program of schoolhouse construction.

It is *practical* because:

1. One of the urgent needs of the moment is new schoolhouses to accommodate the increased enrollments expected in the next few years.

2. There is a critical need to stimulate employment on new construction projects.

3. If the Federal Government relieves the States of this emergency task to erect new buildings and to enlarge old ones, State and local funds will be available to raise classroom teachers' salaries and otherwise to improve the schools.

4. Funds for schoolhouse construction may be allocated according to a plan that realistically appraises the needs of communities. Evidence in support of this statement is the Hospital Construction Act which has relieved the critical shortage of hospital facilities in many poor communities. In considering Federal aid for education, we may draw some valuable lessons from the Federal program for hospital care.

It is *safe*:

1. Let the Federal Government help a school district erect its new school

and its job is done. There is no threat of supervision, no continuing program of Federal aid. The building will stand as a memorial to the interest of the 81st Congress in solving the present crisis in our schools. I would rather have this kind of a memorial than a law which is a constant threat to the autonomy and freedom of our local and county school system.

I urge the Subcommittee to ponder carefully the advisability of having our first experiment in aid to elementary and secondary education be along the lines of schoolhouse construction. If this works out satisfactorily, then we may move on cautiously to subsidies for general education.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

With regard to amendments to pending measures:

1. May I recommend the provisions of the Fogarty Bill, H.R.1570, which in substance is an amended version of S.246 to guarantee essential school services for all children? This bill simply stipulates that 10 per cent of the funds allotted to each State shall be used to furnish non-religious textbooks, bus rides and health aids for all children. States are not required to change their policies. They may either spend these funds in aid of both public and nonpublic school children or request the Federal Government to undertake this responsibility for nonpublic school pupils. This measure grants to nonpublic school children those services to which they have a clear, Constitutional right. In this sense it certainly is a fair and just measure.

2. I suggest that S.246 be amended to restrict Federal aid to needy States. May I recite some facts and figures about the cost of American education to Catholic taxpayers:

- a. Catholic taxpayers are now spend-

threatening about \$200 million a year to maintain their parochial schools.

b. The operation of these schools saves the nation's taxpayers close to \$500 million a year.

c. Most Catholic taxpayers live in the so-called wealthy States which would pay out more than they would receive under the pending Federal aid bills.

d. Under the existing measures, Catholic taxpayers would be expected to pay their share of the taxes for Federal aid and their children would be denied any share of Federal benefits.

In short, if we must have an unfair Federal aid bill, then the very least which Catholic taxpayers may expect of their representatives in Congress is that they will confine the Federal aid to the needy States.

3. Pending measures should be amended to earmark at least 75 per

cent of the funds to raise classroom teachers' salaries. This recommendation is a realistic recognition of the fact that the present crisis in education is largely the result of the low salaries paid to classroom teachers. If Federal aid is to contribute towards the solution of this crisis, the funds must be earmarked so that teachers presently employed and those contemplating employment may have some definite assurance of wages commensurate with the high responsibilities of their vocation. With regard to H.R.4643, I would recommend that Sections 2 and 7 of S.246, which prohibit Federal control of education and require certain reasonable State acceptance provisions, be incorporated into the Barden bill. Even with these amendments, however, the Barden bill is still objectionable on other counts explained in a previous part of this testimony.

SUMMARIZED STATEMENT

The official position of my organization is as follows:

1. The N.C.W.C. reiterates its position that public and parochial schools are both eligible claimants to Federal aid.

2. The N.C.W.C. maintains that at the very minimum Federal aid legislation must include a mandatory provision that funds be appropriated to furnish school services to nonpublic school pupils.

3. Federal aid legislation that fails to include the above provision is unjustly discriminatory and should be defeated.

By way of summary, I wish to state these points:

1. I am opposed to S.246 and H.R. 4643 because

a. They are not genuine equalization measures.

b. They will not improve the educational opportunities of the children most in need of help.

c. They will waste Federal funds by giving aid to States not in need of assistance.

d. They are the equivalent of "class legislation" in that they are designed to benefit public school children exclusively.

e. They violate principles of equity by "counting in" nonpublic school pupils for the purpose of allocation and by "counting them out" in the disbursement of funds.

f. They violate States' rights by forbidding the States to use Federal funds to aid nonpublic school pupils.

2. I favor a schoolhouse construction bill as the most practical and safest method of helping the States in the current educational crisis.

3. I suggest the following essential amendments to the pending measures:

a. A guarantee of essential school

services as provided in the Fogarty Bill, H.R.1570.

b. A restriction of Federal aid to needy States.

c. Earmarking of at least 75 per cent of the funds to raise classroom teachers' salaries.

The New Nihilism

"Soviet actions and policies have long puzzled outside observers. It seems ridiculous to the Western mind to proscribe scientific findings based on observed fact and substitute for it Soviet science based upon fancy. The mock trials of Archbishop Stepinac, Cardinal Mindszenty and the Protestant clergymen do not convince the Western world of the equality of communist justice—quite the reverse.

"This perplexity, however, arises out of an assumption that the objective of Soviet policy is to influence outside opinion. The confusion is eliminated when this assumption is dispensed with. Soviet science and the trials in Hungary and Bulgaria are strictly for home consumption—not for export beyond the Iron Curtain. It is the communist policy when they have seized control to attack truth wherever it is found—in religion, in science, in philosophy and in the arts.

"To clear the path for the firm acceptance of the psychopathic communist state, all sanity in society must be destroyed. Reason must be unhinged; fundamental religious, political, social and scientific truths which give meaning, direction and stability to society must be obliterated. The face and meaning of truth must disappear; words must be robbed of their meaning; and men reduced to gibbering the communist 'fair is foul and foul is fair.'"—Charles J. Walsh in *THOUGHT*, New York, June, 1949.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.